SECRET

File No. 2-R(S)/46.

Collection No.

1946.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.
REFORM BRANCH.

GROUP I

Pros./Serial Nos. (1 - 91)

Subject.

Preliminary discussions for setting up a Constitution-making Body.-- Participation of Indian States.-

Interviews with Cabinet Delegation.

Previous References.	**Later References.**
F. no. 192-P(S)/42 F. no. 376-P(S)/42 F 17-R(S)/46 F. 33-R(S)/46	

Rr/

[illegible] (Unbleached).

MGIPC—[illegible] (Genl) MFP—[illegible] 3-7-40—25,00,000.

[illegible] Extract
(origl. D.535-G/46)

SECRET.

2/2

I spoke to H.E. yesterday about the four points mentioned in D.P.S.V's letter below.

* * *

(3) Representation of Princes on preliminary constitutional discussions.

The Chancellor had given His Excellency to understand that some Rulers wished to take a personal part in these discussions and that he was having some difficulty in persuading them to accept his view that representation should be on the ministerial level.

* * *

Sd/- C.L.Corfield,
1. 2. 46.

2/2

The above extract is for present information. Attention is also invited to the two extracts from Newspapers at slip M. Portion side-lined "A" seems to be interesting as it has a bearing to Pol. Advis. note above.

2.2.46.

2.2.46

4/2/46

R

4/2

(1/M)
2.2.46

Dy. No. 84-R/46. (2)

Though in para. B. of H.M.G's Declaration of 1942 the composition and strength of the proposed Constitution-Making Body were indicated, it would appear from H.E.'s broadcast speech of September, 1945, which has been repeated by the Secy. of State in his announcement to the House of Lords appearing in today's press, that this question will be discussed at the preparatory discussions which H.E. will shortly hold with elected representatives of British India and with Indian States. H.H. the Chancellor must be aware of this and yet has asked that he should be given sufficient time to consult the Standing Committee in the matter before final decisions are taken. All that we can tell him at this stage seems to be that the States' representatives at the Preliminary Conference (of whom the Chancellor himself is not unlikely to be one by virtue of his official position) will doubtless acquaint him of the course of the discussions which would enable him to consult the Standing Committee as desired by him. If approved, we may reply as in the draft submitted for approval. Perhaps it would be as well to let S.G.G. (Reforms) see it before issue.

20.2.46

20.2.46

P.U.C. If the Chancellor's letter implies that the consent of the Standing Committee is necessary to any decisions reached at the preliminary discussions, in so far as those decisions affect the States, the implication cannot be accepted. But there could be no objection to States representatives being 'briefed' by the Standing Cttee as the discussions proceed.

Draft reply submitted.

It is for orders whether SGS (Reforms) shd see the draft before issue.

E. WAKEFIELD

S.G.G. (Reforms) should see. I would like to discuss the programme of constitutional discussions with him on my return from Travancore & my order to see how best the States are to be kept in the picture. I am not sure how the Cabinet Delegation's visit affects the preliminary discussions proposed by H.E.

2. I would then like to discuss [illegible] with the Chancellor early in March. He does not ask for a reply.

CL CORFIELD
21/2/46

[illegible] 27/2/46

S.G.G. (Reforms) (by name)

P.D. U/O No. D.54-2/46 dated 27-2-46

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL (REFORMS)

Discussed with the Political Adviser. The file may be returned to him.

V.P. Menon
1/3

Political Department (by name)

S.G.G. (R) U/O No. 1238/46-G dated 2-3-46.

V.P.Menon,
Reforms Commr.
(Tel. 3150)

I will discuss with the Chancellor.

C 4/3/46

(3) [illegible]
(4)
(5)
[illegible]
5(a) 5(b) & 5(c)

-4-

(6)

P.S.V. tells me that Mr Menon was asked to discuss the telegram below with Home Member & Political Adviser. D.S.R. might fix up a suitable time.

28/2/46

10:30 am on Satʸ, 2nd March in Sir John Thorne's room in the Secretariat has been fixed, subject to Poland's concurrence — which will be assumed by Mr Menon unless he hears to the contrary.

28/2/46

Poland

Thorne 29/2/46

1. Home Member, Pol. Ad., & Mr Menon (Reforms Commr) met this morning to discuss the suggested programme of interviews for the Cabinet Delegation.

2. In regard to the order in which interviews should be given, it was agreed that it was wise to see first Provincial representatives, and to break away, to some extent, from the domination of the central political caucuses. The difficulty is that, when the delegation arrive in Delhi (24th March) Provincial Ministries can only have been formed in Sind, NWFP, Assam & Punjab; and these Ministries will be occupied in their Budget Sessions at least until April 1st. Bihar election results would not be known till 8th March, Madras on 20th March, U.P. on 23rd March and the C.P. not till 5th April. So that Ministry making would not be complete before mid-April at the earliest.

3. In regard to the persons & organisations to be interviewed it was agreed that the best proposal was [illegible]

though Sir Conrad suggested the addition of the Nawab Bhopal.

4. In regard to the States, I then made certain suggestions which H.E. & Sir Conrad Corfield accepted. These suggestions were embodied by me in a brief note which Mr. Menon will incorporate in the draft tel which he is going to submit to H.E. He will send a copy of the note to Poland, or read it over the telephone to him, before sending it to H.E. this morning.

5. My note was roughly as follows:—

(i) It is suggested that the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes should be given an interview immediately after the first batch of Provincial Prime Ministers and Opposition Leaders, i.e. in the same group as representatives of Congress & the Muslim League.

(ii) State Dewans whose names and number & soon after (probably 9 or 10) would be settled in consultation with the Chancellor, might appropriately be given interviews after representatives of the Congress and Muslim League. In addition it may be desirable to give interview to H.H. of Bilaspur as representative of Rulers of small States.

(iii) It is agreed that representatives of big States should be seen separately if they had not already been given interviews under (ii) above.

For information.

Poland (Poland may like to keep these pp until he has seen Mr. Menon's draft)

2/3/46

Mr. Menon has not rung me up. We should try and obtain a copy of the telegram drafted by him as soon as possible.

2. The main thing is to have early confirmation about the number of Dewans and the probable dates on which [illegible]

so think we can make selections in consultation with the Chancellor and give warnings to those concerned. We shall also have to discuss with the Chancellor the most suitable method of issuing invitations, and in this connection we should know how other individuals are being invited.

C 2/3/46

I have since seen Mr. Menon and discussed his draft telegram, of which he will send us a copy after issue.

C 2/3/46

(7) Issue

Will P.S. pl. read corre from p 5 for information.

11/3/46

~~P.S.~~

Seen
C. G. Herbert
11.3.46

(8)

I have just obtained s.no (8) from Mr. Menon.
Mr. Menon thinks that, if States are satisfied that their case is being adequately presented to the Cabinet Delegation, the Delegation themselves will not mind whether they see Rulers or Dewans.
I am trying to telephone to Mr. Crosthwaite, who is dealing with invitations, but have not yet succeeded in reaching

Tel. 2461

-7-

Contact with him

E Birkefield

Pol. Secy.

Thanks. 15/3/46

15/3/46

1 – Chancellor.

2 – Pro-Chancellor, Bikaner, Jam Saheb

3. Bilaspur & Dungarpur.

4. Ministers individually

(a) Chhatari

(b) Madhavrao

(c) Sir C.P.

(d) Sir M. Ismail

(e) Sir Sultan Ahmed
or Sir Joseph Bhore

15/3/46

Mr. Crosthwaite tells me that he is not dealing with the Cabinet Delegation's programme of interviews, but that this is still being dealt with by P.S.V.

E Birkefield
15/3/46

I saw P.S.V. this morning.
The Cabinet Delegation want to cut down substantially the time to be devoted to Formal Interviews i.e. Interviews at which H.E. will be present, & at which formal representations will be made.

P.S.V. had already prepared a draft programme in which only 3 hours were allocated to States – 1 hour to the Chancellor and 2 hours to Ministers. He was reluctant to increase the allocation, but realised the difficulties in which we would be placed if the time available for States was not increased.

After considerable discussion, PSV agreed to allot 5 hours to the States as follows —

Chancellor	one hour	
Pro-Chancellor Bikaner Nawanagar	one hour	
Dungarpur Bilaspur	one hour	
Nawab of Chhatari	40 mins	2 hours
Sir C.P. Ramaswami Aiyar	40 mins	
Sir Mirza Ismail	40 mins	

Remaining States representatives, i.e. Mr. Madhava Rao, and Sir Sultan Ahmed / Sir Joseph Bhore would be granted informal interviews later if Poland thought this desirable (PSV was confident that the Cabinet Delegation would accept any suggestions Poland might make in this connexion)

PSV will in due course ask us to inform the persons concerned that the Cabinet Delegation would like to see them; and we would then issue invitations accordingly.

I send this to Poland for information. If he would like any readjustment, it might be wise for us to contact PSV at once, before the programme of interviews is finalised. It will, however, be difficult for PSV to allot more than 5 hours in all.

E Wakefield
16/3/46

Poland

I think we can see this through without much discussion, as Maharajas is, we presume, away. Sir Sultan Ahmed is ill and Sir Tej [illegible] comes from Bhopal.

2. The grouped States will doubtless object as Bilaspur & Rampur stand by individual survival value whereas Eastern States and Punjab Hill States appear to accept the principle of grouping. But informal interviews at a later stage in the light of protests received will doubtless suffice.

C[illegible] 6/3/46

V.S.
P.S.
[illegible]
[illegible]
1193

(9)

Sec (9). D.P.S.V. informs me that invitations issued yesterday morning direct to Dewans. Under Political instructions I have suggested that P.S.V. should telegraph (Exp. nos., in clear) to H.E.H. the Nizam of H'bad, H.H. of Travancore & H.H. of Jaipur to the following effect — "Invitation sent yesterday to { Nawab of Chhatari / Sir C.P. [illegible] / Sir M. Ismail } to meet Cabinet Delegation on 9th April 1946. Intention was to send invitation through Y.E.H./Y.H. H.E. hopes Y.E.H./Y.H. will allow your President/Dewan/P.M. to accept invitation."

Draft below to issue to All Residents to-day, pl.

[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

(10) [illegible]

-10-

(11)

Drafts to (i) H.H. the Chancellor
(ii) PSV are submitted

21/3/46

Thanks. Issue
21/3/46

(12) Issue

(13)

Discussed with DSR. The final sentence of draft to Chancellor may be altered to read as follows:-

"If however after the [illegible]'s return to India and Sir S. Ahmed's recovery you consider that interviews should be arranged, I will approach the Cabinet Delegation accordingly."

2. We should inform PSV

21/3/46

(14) Issue

(15) Issue

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20) Issue

S. no. (19)

Dis 125-R/46

For information.

(I return file re invitations to Rulers and Ministers [illegible]
to [illegible] [illegible])

S. Narayanaswamy
20/3/46

CS
23.3.46

OVR
23.3.46

ASR

To [illegible]
Return the file [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] .46
27.5.46

(20) Leave

(21)

SECRET.

Note.

~~Reference PUC~~

Sir Stafford Cripps, on the occasion of his last visit to India, gave an interview to Mr Pattabhi Sitaramayya as representative of the States Subjects Conference.

2. In a representation dated 1. 6. 1942 the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes (H. H. the Jam Saheb of Nawanagar) brought to the notice of the Crown Representative certain developments arising out of the Cripps' Mission which, it was stated, "have caused, and are bound to accentuate, grave anxiety to the Princes and their loyal subjects, and have occasioned intense feeling of profound disappointment in the States". Paragraph III(c) of this representation was as follows :-

p.1/cor.F.No.376-P.(S)/42, ~~flag Q.~~ Removed

"(c) Throughout the R. T. C. and previous constitutional discussions, the Rulers and their Ministers were treated by His Majesty's Government and their representatives, as they should be treated, as the sole accredited representatives of the States. This time however, presumably through the efforts of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and others, Sir Stafford Cripps received a British Indian as representative of the so-called State Subjects Conference, which is an adjunct of the Congress and generally speaking is a self-assumed tribune of the very small minority

p.5/cor. - ibid -.

minority of disgruntled elements in the Indian States. We do not know whether this step was taken with the concurrence of His Majesty's Government, but at any rate it has placed the Princes in a very awkward position vis a vis their loyal subjects. In this connection, it may be pointed out that even the All-Parties Report of 1928 ... ... recognized "that the Rulers of the Indian States alone represent their Governments.""

3. The Political Secretary (Sir Kenneth Fitze) recorded the following note on 11. 6. 42 :-

p.1/n. Para. 6.
F.No.576-P.(S)/42.

"6. In sub-paragraph (c) of the same paragraph the Chancellor takes exception to the reception by Sir Stafford Cripps of the representative "of the States Subjects Conference". We had received timely information of the request for this interview and Political Adviser conveyed to Sir Stafford Cripps the opinion that the reception of this gentleman would seriously annoy the Princes and that it might be good tactics to abstain from giving cause for indignation."

4. The Political Department, when forwarding the Chancellor's representation to the India Office, made no reference to this particular point. But the Secy of State in paragraph 5 (c) of ~~their~~ his telegram No 14395 dt 15/8/42 commented as follows :-

~~p.10/cor. ibid~~ -

p.10/Cor. ibid

"(c)

"(c) The British Indian in question was not received as a representative of States: Sir S. Cripps saw many people, e. g., M. N. Roy, opposed to the existing order of things in British India, and was ready to see informally as many people as possible who expressed a sectional point of view."

From P.1.

A draft to P.S.V. is submitted on the lines suggested by Polad.

I have put in para 5 of the draft, as we do not want to embarrass the Chancellor more than is unavoidable.

E.B. Wakefield
23/3/46

Polad

Thanks. Issue
23/3/46

[illegible]
SN
25/3

PS(R)
25/3

(23) Issue

(24)

(25)

Secret.

I spoke to P.S.V. about the telegram below from the Chancellor and suggested that it would make little difference if the Cabinet Delegation agreed to the inclusion of H.H. of Gwalior with the Pro-Chancellor, the Jam Saheb and the Maharaja of Bikaner. I also mentioned the Chancellor's wish to be present on the same occasion and suggested that there would be no harm in this also. P.S.V. promised to pass this on to the Cabinet Delegation and to let us know as soon as possible.

Will D.S.(R) make further enquiries during the course of the day?

C.L. CORFIELD
25-3-46.

D.S.(R)

If, as may be expected, the Cabinet Delegation agree to the inclusion of H.H. of Gwalior, may I ask P.S.V. to issue the invitation to him?

(The Chancellor suggests that he should invite H.H. of Gwalior. This seems inappropriate. But if
A P.S.V. issue the invitation we can inform the Chancellor, & the Chancellor can inform H.H. of Gwalior, that the invitation has been issued)

25/3/46

Pol. ~~Ad~~

A would be correct. H.H. of Gwalior's inclusion need not be given publicity till nearer the time, in order to avoid any additional suggestions.

25/3/46

(26)

PUCs I & II

D.P.S.V informs me that the Cabinet Mission have agreed to see H.H. of Gwalior at the same time as H.H. of Bikaner, Patiala and Nawanagar; they have also agreed to the Chancellor being present at the interview.

P.S.V. is issuing an invitation to H.H. of Gwalior; and publicity will not be given to this until the end of the month.

Draft tel. to H.H. the Chancellor is submitted. The Chancellor arrives in Delhi in the forenoon of March 31st ⊗, and it would presumably suffice if Pol. Ad. tells him then that the Cabinet Mission agree to his being present when the Delegation of Princes is interviewed in the afternoon of 2nd April.

⊗ now Ap 1st (see Serial 30)

I have expanded draft

Draft reply to PVC II is also submitted

Thanks.

~~Pol. Ad.~~

27/3/46

27/3/46

(27) + (28) issues

(29)
(30)
(31)

Dy.No.140-R/46

(32)

Please put up the telegram referred to.

Sd/- E.B. Wakefield
29.3.46

Ref. D.S.R's note above :-
The telegram in question has not been received in office. By '~~Representatives of~~ Constituent States' apparently the Raja of Baghat means those States mentioned in Appendix to Regulation IV of the "Handbook of the Chamber of Princes" who elect their Representatives from amongst the five groups for the Chamber. Sangli ~~being~~ ~~[illegible] State~~ is a member of the Chamber of Princes in his own right.

(Previous papers re the invitation to the Ruling Princes and States to the R.T.C. have been called for from Simla)

29.3.46

29.3.46

ASR

By 'Constituent States' the Raja of Baghat apparently means the States mentioned in Appendix to Regulation IV of the Constitution of the chamber, who elect the 10 representative ~~members~~. This group represents very petty States having no individual survival value and by virtue of their representation in the chamber, it may be assumed that their views will be adequately represented by the Chancellor who has been invited to meet the Cabinet Delegation. We cannot therefore consider the Raja of Baghat's proposal. Apart from this it appears that if at all, separate interviews should be encouraged only if the States have something positive to suggest for example the question of pooled sovereignty or merger with Br. India to the Delegation.

P.T.O.

As far as memory serves, Sangli & Sarila did not attend the R.T.C as representatives of the representative ~~[illegible]~~ electorate of the Chamber but only as the representatives of smaller States.

? papers have been called for.

29/3/46.

DS(R)

~~DS~~

Is the Raja of Baghat a "constituent" member of the Standing Committee under Reg^n^ II 1(xiii) of the Handbook?

2. Is it possible that he means by "Constituent" States not Representative Members of the Chamber but Constituent members of the Standing Committee?

3. When will papers called from Simla arrive?

29/3/46

~~ASR~~

The Raja of Baghat is a member of the Standing Committee under Regln II-1(xii): slip N.

2. No.

3. We will get the papers tomorrow.

29/3/46.

ADS(R)

Enc. (32)

Telegram from Raja of Baghat. d/ 28/3/46

1. The Raja's telegram of 20th March was not received by us.

2. By 'Constituent' States, the Raja presumably means the States, mentioned in the Appendix to Regn. IV of Chamber of Princes Regulations, which elect Representative Members.

3. Vis à vis the Cabinet Delegation, the Chancellor ~~constitutionally~~ technically represents all States in the Chamber: But smaller States have been given a separate opportunity of expressing their view through the Rulers of Dungarpur & Bilaspur. These two Rulers have a special viewpoint in common, i.e. they believe in the 'individual survival value' of small States. It is for consideration whether an opportunity for expressing their views should be given to Rulers of small States who believe in the Efficacy of Grouping or Confederation as affording a means of corporate rather than individual survival. A delegation of such Rulers might, it is suggested, be composed as follows —

Punjab States — Raja of Baghat
Eastern States — Maharaja of Patna
Deccan States — Raja of Sangli, or Raja of Phaltan
C. I. States — Maharaja of Orchha

4. It is understood that Pol: Adviser would like to consult the Chancellor on this point.

E B Wakefield
30/3/46

Pol. Adviser

I spoke to Sir Stafford Cripps and he did not see any reason why a delegation composed as above should not be received.

Please draft to PSV explaining the reasons for an additional group and I will discuss the actual names with the Chancellor. We can amplify the draft to include recommendations about Sir Sultan Ahmad ~~[illegible]~~ Mr Madhava Rao, and Sir K. Haksar

C 1/4/46

(33)

(34)

A

Secret.

Mr Madhava Rau, Dewan of Mysore, came to see me today and pressed very strongly that arrangements should be made for him to see the Cabinet Delegation. He said that he had received a telegram from H.H. the Maharaja desiring him to put this request forward and he would be very grateful if arrangements could be made accordingly.

I told Mr Madhava Rau that I would put the request forward and would let him know by telegram. He is returning to Mysore tomorrow. I asked him on return to point out to His Highness the Maharaja that the selection of representatives to see the Delegation had not been made on the basis of the interests of individual States but in order to reflect the general views of the various categories of States which had to be fitted into the future constitutional picture. Mr Madhava Rau promised to point this out to His Highness and to explain that there was no question of Mysore State having been omitted.

B

Will D.S.(R) please add this request to our letter to P.S.V. in the hope that an informal interview can be given to Mr Madhava Rau, who will return to Delhi by air for this purpose as soon as a date is known ?

1-4-46.

D.S.(R)

Ref. Pol. Ad's orders on pr. page, and above.

A draft about (a) delegation of 'Group Command' Rulers and (b) Mr. Madhava Rau is submitted.

Nothing has been said about Sir [illegible] or Sir Sultan Ahmed.

EWakefield
1/4/46

Pol Ad

Spoken to Chancellor. [illegible]

2/4/46

Pol. Ad. mentioned to H.E on 2/4/46 that ~~the~~ it was proposed that the Groups of States mentioned in Sno (35) should be represented by :-

Central India — Maharaja of Orchha
Deccan States — Raja of Sangli
Eastern States — Maharaja of Patna
Punjab States — Raja of Baghal.

Pol. Ad. informed Residents of the position at this morning's session of the Residents' Conference. Resdt. Deccan States said that the Raja of Sangli might be precluded by illness from coming to Delhi; and suggested that, if this were so, the Raja of Phaltan should take his place.

Pol. Ad. agreed; and I have informed D.P.S.V., who will see that ~~H.E.~~ the position is explained to H.E. i.e. that if the Raja of Sangli is invited & cannot come, the Raja of Phaltan will be invited in his place.

3/4/46

(36)

(37)

Sno (37). Spoken to Pol. Ad.

Before replying, we should await the result of our letter at Sno (35)

3/4/46

21/3/46. P.S.V. asked for advice about telegrams etc to Cabinet Mission asking them to see representatives of States subjects

S.No.(22)

23/3/46 We replied, suggesting that the Cabinet Mission should themselves raise the question with the Chancellor. We added that the Cabinet Delegation would presumably not wish to interview Brit. India subjects claiming to represent States' subjects, nor representatives of organisations having no legitimate existence in an individual State.

S.No.(23)

28/3/46 The following is an extract from the Minutes of a Meeting of the Mission and H.E. held on 28/3/46 -

"Question whether Delegation should see Representatives of the Indian States Peoples.

Sir Conrad Corfield advised against seeing the States Peoples Conference of which Nehru is President because they were an organisation cutting across the integrity of individual States, and operating from Brit. India. Ministers felt, however, that it might help with the Congress if they see some representatives of the States peoples. The Viceroy felt it would be difficult for him as C.R. to see representatives of the States Peoples Conference.

It was agreed that Sir C. Corfield should consult the Chancellor with a view to finding a solution, e.g. on the basis that two or three elected representatives of the State peoples drawn from elected institutions in individual States should be chosen to see the Delegation."

2/4/46

P.T.O.

2/4/46 The following is an extract from "Note of an interview between the Cabinet Mission and H.H. the Chancellor on 2/4/46".

"The S/S said that there was one matter which the Delegation wished to consult the Chancellor about. It had been represented to them that they should meet representatives of the people of the State. H.H. said he believed the States would strongly object to representatives of the States Peoples Conference being invited to give their views, and that there would be no justification for it because the members of that Association, though many of them were good people, were self-nominated; they were not elected by the peoples of the States. Sir S. Cripps said that he understood that some of those associated with the States Peoples Conference were in fact elected representatives in their own States. He wondered whether the Rulers would be prepared to nominate three or four people who were elected representatives in their own States whom the Delegation might see as representatives of the State peoples. H.H. said if the individual Rulers concerned had no objection this might be acceptable."

Attached is a list of the office bearers and leading members of the A.I. States Peoples' Conference. Information is not available in our office whether any of these individuals is also

slip 2 "Printers page 21 infra"

a member of a Legislative Assembly in his own State.

The A.I.S.P.C. is affiliated to Congress; there is also an All India Muslim League States Peoples organization; no doubt there are similar organizations for Sikhs, Marathas etc. Perhaps the Cabinet Delegation will not press the suggestion that they should give an interview to delegates from one of these bodies — the Hindu one — if they are told that this will involve them granting interviews to delegates from other Communal inter-States organizations.

Another possible compromise, differing from those so far suggested, is that Sir S. Cripps himself shd see informally representatives of one or more of these States Peoples organizations, without the Viceroy or S/S being present.

4/4/46

~~Pol. Ad.~~

H. H. will be sending us a letter saying that he has consulted Rulers and Ministers, who see considerable objection to Sir S. Cripps proposal. We may await this letter and also the letter from P.S.V. saying that the other interviews we had

-37-

recommended cannot now be granted

4/4/46

In regard to Sir Stafford Cripps' suggested interviews with Mr. Gopalaswami Iyengar and Sir B.L. Mitter,× Mr. Turnbull tells me that he does not yet know whether these interviews will, in fact, be granted. If they are granted, publicity will as far as possible be avoided. Interviews may be put into three categories — ① Formal, at which H.E. and the Cabinet Mission sit together
② Semi-formal, at which two Ministers sit together
(3) Informal, given by any one or more of the Ministers, almost in a private capacity.

EBWakefield
5/4/46

× Sir S. Cripps "had a talk" with Sir B.L. Mitter on the p.m. of 5/4/46

EM
6/4/46

DSR
R

(38)

F.R.
Draft to Chancellor is submitted.
Before approaching P.S.V. again for interviews to Mr. Madhava Rao & Sir Sultan Ahmed, I would like to speak, pl.

EBWakefield
5/4/46

~~Pol Ad.~~

Spoken to Pol Ad.
Draft to issue as amended.
We should not at present approach P.S.V. again as there is no chance, at the moment, of getting a favourable response from the Cabinet Mission.

39 (Issue)

EBWakefield
6/4/46

(40)

F.R. (S.no. 40).

×P.34 ante
○P.35 ante

Re. our passages marked respecting A and B in minutes of (i) Cabinet Delⁿ meeting of 28/3/46 and (ii) Cabinet Delⁿˢ interview with the Chancellor on 2/4/46.

The Chancellor asks, in F.R., that his reply be brought to the notice of the Cabinet Delⁿ.

Draft submitted.

8/4/46

Pol. A.d.

Amplified draft below may issue

8/4/46

PR. see D. release
A.F.R. file to me
9/4/46

Seen. Thanks

(41)

(42)

(43)

(44)

F.R. Poland's initial orders taken. Issue draft below to P.S.V.

10/4/46

(45) - Issue

Dy No. 242-R/46 (46)

Pl. see S.no (46)

Reply to Raja of Baghat's letter at S.no (44) is put up in draft for f/o approval. The draft follows the lines of our letter to the Chancellor at S.no (39)

E Birchfield 11/4/46

Pol. A.D.

Thanks C 11/4/46

(47) - Issue

Issue draft D.O. below to Res^t Mysore

E Birchfield 12/4/46

(48) - (49) Issue

The S/S saw the Chancellor on 12th April. The Chancellor asked him to give an interview to Sir Sultan Ahmed & Sir Manubhai Mehta. The S/S said he unfortunately could not see any more people before Easter

Extract from Notes of Cab. Missions interviews

E Birchfield 16/4/46

(50) (51) Issue

Dy No 311-R/46 (52)

P.U.C. Paras 2 & 3 The Raja of Baramba has been told that no proposal for the absorption of the Orissa States in the Province of Orissa is being considered by the Cabinet Delegation; and a copy of the corres^ce has been forwarded to Res. Eastern States.

S.no. (51)

From pre page)

Para 4. The prospect of the Cabinet Mission seeing a delegation of Rulers representative of smaller States becomes more & more remote. ~~as~~

~~SNo~~(53) DFA.

(from pre page)

Pol ~~Ad~~.

[illegible]

E. Brinkerfield
2/5/46.

Thanks
Co 3/5/46

(53) - Issue

(54)

(55) Issue

— (56) —

Interviews with Cabinet Mission

Regarding delegation of small State Rulers also Islam in grouping, pl see :-

S.No. (35) Our letter of 2nd April

S.No. (39) PSV's reply of 4th April

J in LF Pol Ad's note of 4th May.

Draft to PSV is submitted

E. Brinkerfield
16/5/46

Pol Ad.

Thanks. Issue
Co 17/5/46

(57) Issue

(58)

Pl see snos (56) & (58)

Draft to Raja of Baghat submitted.

The last para has been added tentatively

E. Brinkerfield
17/5/46

Pol Ad. I would wait now until the Raja of Baghat comes to Delhi for the other delegation

(59)-(69) - Issues

Dno 343-R/46

(61)

For information.

22/5/46.

CD
22.5.46

OUFF
22.5.46

ASR
28/5

(62)

(63)

Draft for approval.

E.B. Wakefield 22/5/46

Pol. Ad.

Thanks 22/5/46

64 (Issue)

(65)

D.P.S.V. has asked that H.E. may be supplied with a 'brief' for the interview on Monday with the Rulers of Orchha, Sangli, Patna & Baghat.

Draft is submitted

E.B. Wakefield
23/5/46

Pol. Ad.

Thanks. Please send in the form below 23/5/46

(66) Issue

(67)

Secy (67). Pol. Ad's orders have been taken. Issue telegram below.

E.B. Wakefield
24/5/46

ASR

(68) ~~Issue~~

(69)

(70) - (72) - Issues

Dno 367 - R/46

(73)

It is understood that the Pol. Adv. will be inviting H.H. the Raja of Sangli to lunch on Sunday the 26th May, 1946, when presumably he will tell His Highness who the other members of the Delegation are.

25/5/46

CS
25.5.46

O.V.R.
25.5.46

A.S.R.

D.S.R.

(74)

(75)

(76) ~~Issue~~

(77)

(78)

(79) ~~Issue~~

(80)

(81)

Dno 386 - R/46 (82)

If Pol. Ad. approves, extracts from sno (82) will be sent to Resdts for their information —

Portion marked A to Resdt. Pb. St.
B .. C. I
C .. Deccan St. & Kolhapur
D .. Eastern St.

29/5/46

DSR
R 29/5

Pol Ad.

29/5/46

(83) - (85) - Issues

Dno 384-R/46

(86)

(87)-(89) Issue

Dno 375-R/46

44

(90)

This has come in today's post. As Political Adviser is seeing the Raja of Baghat tomorrow, he may like to read it now. Paragraph 4 is relevant.

C Griffin

25. 5. 46.

Pol. Adviser

(Residence)

I saw the Raja Sahib to-day and explained

(a) why the discussions prior to the issue of the Statement and Memorandum had to be confidential and on the highest level;

(b) that by neither of these documents had the States been committed in advance, which was their well-known desire;

(c) that the answers to his queries about the size of groups of States etc would presumably emerge from the proposed negotiations, and could not now be answered by the CR or H.M.G.;

/ with British India

(d) that the question of the personnel of the States Negotiating Committee would be discussed in Bombay: and that

(e) at all stages of future negotiations the Pol. Dept would give any assistance for which it was asked.

I also pointed out that as a result of constitutionalisation, which appeared inevitable it would be necessary to bear in mind that the views of State subjects would powerfully influence the acceptability and practicability of any grouping schemes which might be put forward at this stage.

I said more or less the same to the Raja of Sangli yesterday.

W.
27/5/46

Seen by P.S.

~~D.S.R.~~
27/5/46

R
27/5

OSD (Ref.)
28/5

KH
31.5

~~[illegible]~~

R
2/6

R
3/6

Dno 379 - R/46 (91)

~~[illegible]~~

Dno 387 - R/46 (92)

For information. OSA may see.

S. Narayanaswamy
29/5/46

CSO
29.5.46

OVR
29.5.46

ASR

~~DSR~~

~~DSD~~ 3/6

Recd from Sundar on 3/6

WAD / R
3/6

R
3/6

Seen.
W. Herbert
31. 5. 46.

3/6/46

AD(Min)
~~2.7.46~~
3.8.46

Recd
10.9.46

F2-R [illegible]

Appendices to the

Notes

Appx I to Nts

Representation submitted by the Raja of Baghat, Chairman of All-India Constituent States Union, on behalf of Nine Representative Members of the Chamber of Princes representing 103 States whose Rulers are not members of the Chamber of Princes in their own right, but which are mentioned in Appendix to Regulation 4 of the Chamber of Princes Handbook.

To

The Right Honourable Lord Pethick-Lawrence,
The Right Honourable Sir Stafford Cripps,
The Right Honourable Mr. A. V. Alexander,
Members of the Cabinet Delegation,
New Delhi.

Representation submitted by the Raja of Baghat, Chairman of All-India Constituent States Union, on behalf of Nine Representative Members of the Chambers of Princes representing 103 States whose Rulers are not members of the Chamber of Princes in their own right, but which are mentioned in Appendix to Regulation 4 of the Chamber of Princes Handbook.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:

Speaking about the object of the Cabinet Delegation in India Mr. Clement Attlee, the Prime Minister, *inter alia* stated:

Pronouncements regarding position of States (big or small) in New India Constitution—Mr. Attlee.

> "I am hoping that statesmen of Britian, and of the Princly Order in India, will be able to work out a solution of the problems of bringing together the various constituent parts, and, there again, we must see that Indian States find their due place. I do not believe for a moment that the Indian Princes would desire to be a bar in the forward march of India."

Lord Pethick-Lawrence.

Answering a question in Delhi as to why it was necessary to invite the Indian States to participate in the discussions, Lord Pethick-Lawrence on the 25th of March 1946 stated:

> "We have come in the hope of enabling Indians to produce a constitutional structure for India as a whole."

Addressing the session of the Chamber of Princes in January 1946, His Excellency Lord Wavell, the Crown Representative, referring to the small States stated:

Crown Representative's advice to small States.

> "Although inadequate finances is a misfortune for which in itself, the Darbars concerned are not responsible, it is, I suggest, incumbent upon them so to modify the constitutional position of their States, as to ensure the welfare of their subjects for the future. To achieve this, three conditions are necessary. Every State should possess political stability, adequate financial resources, and effective association of the people with the administration. If a State cannot fulfil these conditions, I strongly urge that it should arrange to do so, either by joining a larger unit, or by combining with other small States, to form a political entity of a sufficient size. I am convinced that only by this means will the small States be able to keep abreast of progress in other parts of India, and I, therefore, trust that they will not withhold their consent to such modifications of their relations with the Crown, as present circumstances and future requirements demand, with any expectation that by so doing, they may be able to perpetuate conditions which are out of date."

Contemplated new relationship between Britain and India, and the position of Indian States in a free India.

2. It is already announced that His Majesty's Government has determined to transfer political power to India, and to rest the relationship between India and Great Britain in a Treaty, which is to be entered into by the two countries. To achieve this object, the Cabinet Delegation is sent to India to facilitate the setting-up of a Constituent Assembly, in consultation with all the important sections of the people, and the important political elements in the country, with a view to enable them to draw up an All-India Constitution on an agreed basis. Pursuant to this objective, the Cabinet Delegation has interviewed representatives of various political parties in British India, and some Princes and Ministers of some States, and also other leaders from various parts of British India, and Indian India, with a view to enable them to set up a Constituent Assembly, representing and reflecting all the important elements and interests in the country, as the Constitution to be drawn up by the Consistiuent Assembly is to be an All-India Constitution comprising both British India and Indian States.

Present Constitutional position of the 103 States

3. It is clear that, in the proposed Constitution, the scope and the contents of Paramountcy and the status and position of the States *qua* British India, as well as *qua* the British Crown, are to be radically and effectively altered, as the States, either in their own rights, or in groups, are going to be integral units of the All-India Constitution, containing sovereignty within itself.

These States kept ignorant of Memorandum submitted by Chamber of Princes, and have not been consulted by the Delegation.

4. The 103 States referred to above have been recognised as Indian States, under the Government of India Act, 1935, and, as such, they are empowered to accede to the Federation, on a voluntary basis. On their accession to the Federation, they are given definite representation in both the Chambers of the Federal Legislature. Thus, their integrity and position under the Constitution Act, 1935, have been secured on the recognition of their existing status and position. It is quite clear that the Constituent Assembly, which is to be set up, will have to frame a new Constitution, on an agreed basis, in which these States will also have to be included.

Their views should be ascertained by the Delegation, and these States should be adequately represented in the Constituent Assembly, and be given their proper place in the Constitution.

5. The representatives of these States have not been consulted by the Cabinet Delegation. The Chamber of Princes has submitted a Memorandum, purporting to represent the views, sentiments and attitude of the States, mostly the large States. These 103 States are not aware of the contents of the Memorandum submitted by the Chamber of Princes. When it is remembered that all these 103 States are to be included in the new Constitution, which is to be drawn up by the Constituent Assembly, and that these States individually may not become the constituent members of the new Constitution, but may become constituent member, or members by grouping themselves, either in one unit or more then one unit, having regards to their resources, population, area and other relevant and material factors, it is easy to understand why it is very intensely felt by these States that their views, sentiments and attitude, as regards the nature and the pattern of the new Constitution, which is to be drawn up by the Constituent Assembly, should be ascertained and taken into consideration, by the Cabinet Delegation, and that they should be given an adequate and affective representation in the Constituent Assembly, which is to draw up the new Constitution. Hereto annexed and marked "A" is a tabular statement showing the area, population and revenue of these 103 States.

Present constitutional position of these States.

6. The present constitutional position of these 103 States may be summed up as follows: The Report of the Butler Committee divides the Indian States into three classes. The first class contains 108 States, the Rulers of which are Members of the Chamber of Princes in their own right. The second class contains 127 States, the Rulers of which are represented in the Chamber of Princes by twelve members of their order elected by themselves. Of these 127 States, 24 States are already admitted by the Chamber of Princes, as Members in their own right, and the remaining 103 States are represented in the Chamber of Princes by nine members elected by them. Total population of these 103 States is 22,52,209. The toal area comprised of these States is 18,070 square miles, and the total revenue is Rs. 1,29,92,073. The third class contains 327 Estates, Jagirs, and others, which are not dealt with by the Report of the Butler Committee, and with which class we are not concerned, for the Report of the Butler Committe stated that their proposals concerned mainly with the States included in classes I and II. It states:

> "We may say at once that, in the main, our remarks and proposals have in view the first two classes only of Indian States, the rulers of which have, in greater or less degree, political power, legislative, executive and judicial, over their subjects.

Referring to these States, the Report further stated:

> "......in view of the historical nature of the relationship between the Paramount Power and the Princes, the latter should not be transferred without their own agreement, to a relationship with a new government, in British India, responsible to an Indian legislature."

This basic principle was recognised and given effect to by section 6 of the Constitution Act, 1935, which provided for the voluntary accession of these States to the All-India Federation, an accession which did not involve the entire elimination of Paramountcy, in the field not covered by the Instrument of Accession.

These States should have adequate representation in the Constituent Assembly, if as contemplated, they are to be in the picture of an Independent India.

From the pronouncements of His Majesty's Government, and the Members of the Cabinet Delegation and of the responsible Indian leaders, the Constitution which is to be drawn up envisagesthe entire elimination of Paramountcy, and the inclusion of the States in the Constitution. If this is to be done, and it seems that it has to be done, to give effect to the declared policy of His Majesty's Government, these States should have adequate representation on the Constituent Assembly, to enable them to evolve a form, in which they may fit in individually, or by grouping into one unit, or more than one unit, or any other manner, in which they can at once become an integral part of the Constitution, having regard to their present position, resources and population without losing their integrity.

Examination of certain schemes that have been suggested.

7. It has been suggested that, for an effective and enduring All-India Constitution, the States, which represent one-third of India, both in population and in area, should be distributed into twenty or twenty-five units of the All-India Constitution, as compared with elven or fifteen Provinces of British India. If this is the objective, it appears that, even all the 108 States, specifically mentioned in the First Schedule of the Govern-

ment of India Act, 1935 and which are now Members of the Chamber of Princes in their own right, are not going to be, and cannot be, the constituent members of the new Constitution. It is equally clear that these 103 States (nine of whom are specially mentioned in the First Schedule to the Government of India Act, 1935,) the Rulers of which are represented in the Chamber of Princes by nine Members of their order, elected by themselves, and which are given representation under the Government of India Act, 1935, will inevitably have to group themselves in such a manner, as to become the constituent Members of the Constitution.

These 103 States were never consulted & H. H. of Bhopal the Chancellor refused to give them copies of the Memorandum, submitted by him, as well as the so called representatives of the Smaller States.

The States, whose Rulers are Members of the Chamber of Princes in their own right, have put forward their views in the matter, through H. H. The Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, whilst these 103 States, which are represented by 9 representative Members in the Chamber of Princes, were *not* given any opportunity to put forward their views, as regards their place in the Constituent Assembly as well as the proposed Constitution. They were not even supplied with a copy of the Memorandum, sent by H. H. The Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, or the Representatives of the so-called 'Smaller States,' *viz.,* Their Highnesses of Bilaspur and Dungarpur who, unfortunately defined the 'Smaller States,' to mean only the 'Smaller States,' who are Members of the Chamber of Princes—to the Cabinet Delegation, as regards the representation of the States on the Constituent Assembly, and also as regards their position and role in the proposed Constitution.

Pronouncements of the Crown Representatives on the anomalies of the composition of the Chamber.

8. The growth of the Membership of the Chamber of Princes, ever since its inception in 1921, has been haphazard, and is not based on any one recognised principle or basis. While adverting to the classification of States for purposes of entry into the Chamber of Princes, His Excellency the Viceroy observed, in the course of his address to the Ruling Princes and Chiefs, on the 20th January 1919, thus:

> "We felt that the whole question of salutes needed most careful investigation, in view of the anomalies which appear to exist, and, we hold, therefore, that it would be unwise to base upon the salute list, as it stands, any fundamental distinction between the more important States and the remainder. It appeared to us that if such a distinction is made, it must be made on constitutional considerations, that is to say, upon the nature of the link between the individual States and the Crown."

In 1921, the salute basis, for want of any other ready-made expedient, was adopted tentatively as the basis for the classification of States for purposes of entry into the Chamber of Princes, as Members in their own right. Adverting to the salute basis, however, H. E. the Viceroy observed, in his speech delivered on the 20th January 1919, while introducing the Montford Report to the Chamber of Princes, thus:

"Your Highnesses will remembr that in my last speech, I said that Mr. Montagu and I, felt that the whole question of salutes needed, most careful investigation, in view of the anomalies which appeared to exist. If the principle, which I now advocate, is to be adopted, as the basis of qualification, it will be additionally desirable that this investigation should be undertaken at an early date, in order that, anomalies whether already existing, or likely to ensue from the institution of the dividing line, should be corrected wherever possible. My Government are ready to give their earnest consideration to this matter, and will make necessary recommendations to the Secretary of State, for submission to His Imperial Majesty, in due course." The suggested investigation has not been undertaken in spite of the passage of 27 years.

His Excellency the Viceroy, again on 3rd November 1919, while reiterating his observations of the 20th January 1919 in this regard, observed thus:

> "We therefore, recommended in our Report that the line should be so drawn as to separate Rulers, who enjoy full powers of administration from the others. I said in my speech that, in my opinion, the essential question for classification purposes would appear to be, whether a Ruler has normally the power to legislate for the welfare of his subjects, and to conduct the administration, without the interference of British officials."

Thus the main criteria laid down for the classification of States, for Membership in their own right in the Chamber of Princes, were, (i) legislative independence, and (ii) internal autonomy.

Some States who are Members of the Chamber, in their own right, do not satisfy the criteria laid down.

A number of Salute and Non-Salute States, which are now Members of the Chamber of Princes in their own right, cannot be said to satisfy these criteria. Even the "extended criminal powers" conferred on some of the 11-gun Chiefs in 1925, in effect, mean that "the Ruler has the authority to dispose of all classes of criminal offences committed within the State, by the subject of the State or others, except the British subjects and Europeans and Americans." Further it is provided that "persons sentenced to death, transportation or imprisonment for life should be given every facility to present a petition for mercy to the Agent to the Governor-General, and pending such consideration, "execution of persons sentenced to death would be stayed." Such are the "extended criminal powers" conferred by a Sanad in 1925 on the Rulers of some States. These States are Members of the Chamber, in their own right, while, on the other hand, certain States specifically mentioned in the Table of Seats of the First Schedule of the Government of India Act, 1935, have not been admited as Members in their own right, into the Chamber of Princes.

Some of the 103 States are far ahead, in many ways of States, who are Members of the Chamber, in their own right.

9. It is to be noted that out of the 140 States, whose Rulers are members of the Chamber of Princes in their own right, 42 States have revenues ranging between five to ten lakhs of Rupees, 25 States have revenue ranging between three to five lakhs of Rupees, whilst 11 States have revenue below three lakhs of Rupees per year. It is also to be remembered that, out of the 103 States dealt with herein, 10 States have revenue ranging between Rs. 3 to Rs. 8 lakhs, and 67 States of these have capacity to spend from Rs. 5 to Rs. 40 *per capita* of their population, for improved standards of administration, on lines similar to those prevailing in British India. and in the progressive States of Mysore, Travancore and Cochin. Some of these 103 States are industrially developed and have vast resources. In some of these 103 States Representative institutions have been functioning for over a decade.

Legislatures elected on the basis of universal adult franchise, with a Popularly elected Minister, exist, and have powers more or less similar to the Legislatures in British India.

These 103 States have as good, if not better in some instances, right to be represented on the Constituent Assembly, in comperison to States, who are Members of the Chamber in their own right

All these facts are stated only to emphasise that, as regards representation on the Constituent Assembly, there is no warrant for drawing a distinction between the Rulers of States, who are now Members of the Chamber of Princes, in their own right, and these 103 States, whose Rulers are represented in the Chamber of Princes by nine of their Order. All the States included in categories I and II of the Indian States Committee should, in fairness, be treated alike, for purposes of representation in the Constituent Assembly, and should be given an opportunity of being heard by the Cabinet Delegation before the representation on the Constituent Assembly is settled.

Case of 18 States which have been attached to other States.

10. Out of these 103 States, 18 States in Western India States Agency and Gujerat have been attached to larger States without their willing consent. Apart from the legal and constitutional objections to the Scheme of Attachment, and the India (Attachment of States) Act, 1944, the most vital objection to the Scheme is the absence of willing consent, or assent on the part of the Rulers of the Attached States to this Scheme. The so called consent or assent obtained from the Attached States is illusory. When the principle of self-determination is accepted as the basic principle, for solving political problems, and, in particular, for solving the political problems of India, and when voluntary consent is postulated, as the basic principle of any political arrangement in India, it is surprising that it is not thought necessary to secure the voluntary consent of the Rulers of the Attached States to the Scheme of Attachment, and that the Scheme should have been foisted on them, entirely against their will, and the will, of their subjects. As the problem of the States is to be reconsidered, for the purpose of the proposed new Constitution, it is only fair, just and equitable that the whole Scheme and the policy of attachment, which has been hastily put into force, during the last two years, should be withdrawn, and these attached States, like other States, should be given an opportunity to evolve a solution by grouping along with other States. It is significant to note that Parliament has made it quite clear, that the Scheme of Attachment is not to be extended to other small States. Thus, in principle, the solution, which is accepted, is that of grouping. Some of these 103 States have already adopted grouping for the purposes of joint services, and this method can be further explored for the purpose of constituting them as a unit or units of the proposed Constitution.

The Rulers of these 103 States prepared to adopt full responsible democratic government in their States individually, or by grouping. They claim they, as well as their subjects, should be represented on the Constituent Assembly.

11. The Rulers of these 103 States individually, if their States fit in individually in the proposed Constitution, or by grouping themselves into one or more units of the proposed Constitution, are, in response to the democratic forces, which are operating on the minds of their subjects and having regard to the political development in British India, prepared to introduce immediately responsible Government in their States, or in the unit or units, and accept the position of constitutional heads of their States. The representation, which the Rulers of these States are seeking on the Constituent Assembly, is the representation both for themselves, and their subjects. Whilst accepting the position of constitutional heads of their respective States, these Rulers are keen and earnest

in securing representation for themselves, and their own subjects, on the Constituent Assembly, with a view to enable them to put forward their views as regards the form and pattern of the proposed Constitution, of which they are going to be an integral part.

Rulers prepared to accept the same pattern as may be evolved for British Indian Provinces, and become Dynastic Constitutional Heads of their States.

12. For the internal structure of these States or of the unit or units, which may be carved out by the grouping of these States, the Rulers of these States are prepared to accept, as far as possible, the same pattern as may be adopted in the British Indian Provinces, and other progressive states provided their Dynastic status, as constitutional heads of their respective States, is preserved. The details as regards the whole internal structure, and their places in the Constitution will have to be worked out by the Constituent Assembly. The considerations set out above are briefly mentioned to indicate the attitude of these Rulers towards their subjects and the proposed Constitution.

Demand of these States for representation for themselves in the Constituent Assembly is fair, just, equitable and reasonable.

13. When the principle of self-determination is accepted, as the basic principle, for settling the future Constitution of India, when voluntary consent is postulated as the basic principle of political arrangement in India, and when emphasis is laid on securing an agreed solution, it is but fair, just and equitable that these States, and their subjects, should be given representation in the Constituent Assembly, which would mould the future constitution and destiny of India, including these States, which are an integral and vital part of the body politic of India. If no representation is given in the Constituent Assembly to these States, including their subjects, the result would be that these States, and their subjects, would be included in the Constitution, without their having been given any representation, or say, in framing the Constitution itself, a situation which is at once strange and anomalous. In demanding such a representation on the Constituent Assembly, on a basis similar to that which is recognised and given under the Government of India Act, 1935, in Schedule I to the Act, these Rulers are demanding only what is reasonable, fair, just and due to them, having regard to their history, place, position, status and importance in the political life of India, in which they constitute an important political element.

Interview with the Cabinet Delegation sought.

14. With a view to put forward their case for securing adequate representation on the Constituent Assembly, it is requested that these nine representative members of these States, or two or more, in their representative capacity, should be given an interview by the Cabinet Delegation, to enable them to convince the Cabinet Delegation that their representation on the Constituent Assembly is absolutely essential, if the Constituent Assembly is to evolve a stable and enduring Constitution for the whole of India. It is earnestly requested that such an interview should be given before the Constituent Assembly is set up, so that their representatives may have an opportunity to express their views regarding the composition of the Constituent Assembly, and the basic principles of the Constitution.

Durgasingh
C.I.E.
Raja of Baghat State,
Chairman All-India Constituent States Union.

SOLAN
3rd May 1946.

APPENDIX 'A'

SERIAL NUMBER		Name of State.	Area in sq. miles, as per 1939 figures.	Population to the nearest thousand, as per 1939 figures.	Revenue, as per 1939 figures.	Ratio of Revenue to population, as per 1939 figures.
Constituent States specifically mentioned in Schedule I to the Government of India Act, 1935.	Constituent States not specifically mentioned in Schedule I to the Government of India Act, 1935.				Rs.	Rs.
1		Sandur	200	20,000	1,53,000	8
2		Baraundha	218	16,000	45,000	3
3		Miraj (Junior)	196	41,000	3,17,000	8
4		Kurundwad (Senior)	182	44,000	2,38,000	5
5		Kurundwad (Junior)	116	40,000	1,89,000	5
6		Aundh	501	76,000	3,18,000	4
7		Ramdurg	169	35,000	1,77,000	5
8		Bonai	1296	80,000	1,95,000	3
9		Nilgiri	284	68,594	1,81,000	3
PART I. STATES IN BOMBAY AND RAJPUTANA						
	1	Lakhtav	247	23,754	2,57,000	10
	2	Sayla	222	15,283	1,58.000	10
	3	Chuda	78	12,915	1,38,000	10
	4	Vala	190	14,069	1,96,000	14
	5	Jasdan	296	34,056	4,65,000	14
	6	Manavadar	101	29,084	6,54,000	22
	7	Thana-Devli	117	16,005	3,00,000	19
	8	Vadia	90	13,719	2,50,000	18
	9	Lathi	42	9,404	1,62,000	17
	10	Muli	133	17,109	1,89,000	11
	11	Bajana	183	13,481	2,30,000	17

12	Virpur	67	8,050	1,24,000	14
13	Malia	103	12,142	1,40,000	12
14	Kotda-Sangani	90	10,420	1,50,000	13
15	Jetpur	120	34,000	2,98,377	9
16	Bilkha	135	29,633	3,75,000	12
17	Patdi	165	17,225	3,03,000	18
18	Vijayanagar	135	8,491	93,075	11
19	Kadana	132	17,560	1,08,440	6
20	Tharad	1260	54,311	95,000	2
21	Surgana	264	15,235	75,000	5
22	Savanur	73	20,320	2,18,000	9
23	Bhadarwa	27	11,048	1,08,271	9
24	Wao	759	20,721	55,000	2
25	Jambughoda	143	11,385	1,36,610	12
26	Malpur	97	13,552	1,06,000	8
27	Mansa	25	16,942	1,44,000	8
28	Mohanpur	89	14,264	64,000	5
29	Khirasra	48	4,663	75,000	16

PART II. STATES IN THE PUNJAB

30	Pataudi	53	18,873	1,44,000	7
31	Dirajana	100	28,216	1,43,000	5
32	Baghal	120	26,352	89,000	4
33	Baghat	33	9,725	1,50,000	16
34	Balsan	57	6,864	50,000	8
35	[illegible] BHASSI	94	15,413	79,000	5
36	Bija	5	994	13,000	13
37	Darkoti	5	531	1,700	3
38	Dhami	28	5,232	30,000	6
39	Jubbal	274	26,021	6,39,000	25
40	Keonthal	186	25,560	1,72,000	7
41	Kuthar	21	3,760	42,000	11
42	Kumharsain	84	12,781	63,500	5
43	Kunihar	7	2,061	17,000	9

APPENDIX 'A'—*Contd.*

SERIAL NUMBER		Name of State.	Area in sq. miles, as per 1939 figures.	Population to the nearest thousand as per 1939 figures.	Revenue, as per 1939 figures. Rs.	Ratio of Revenue to population as per 1939 figures. Rs.
Constituent States specifically mentioned in Schedule I to the Government of India Act, 1935.	Constituent States not Specifically mentioned in Schedule I to the Government of India Act, 1935.					
	44	Mahlog	49	8,155	43,000	6
	45	Mangal	14	1,248	3,600	3
	46	Nalagarh	276	50,015	2,10,000	4
	47	Sangri	21	3,497	10,000	3
	48	Tharoch	86	4,568	60,000	13
		PART III. STATES IN BIHAR AND ORISSA				
	49	Rairakhol	833	35,710	93,000	3
	50	Khandpara	244	77,929	1,67,000	2
	51	Daspalla	568	43,402	1,34,000	3
	52	Hindol	312	48,896	1,34,000	3
	53	Athmalik	730	64,272	2,54,000	4
	54	Ranpur	203	47,711	75,000	2
	55	Narsinghpur	199	40,878	1,11,000	3
	56	Athgarh	168	50,148	1,46,000	3
	57	Pal-Lahara	452	27,974	80,000	3
	58	Baramba	142	46,688	99,000	2
	59	Tigiria	46	24,822	47,000	2
	60	Kharswan	153	44,805	1,43,000	3
		PART IV. STATES IN THE CENTRAL PROVINCES				
	61	Udaipur	1,055	97,738	2,25,000	2
	62	Sakti	138	48,589	1,08.000	2

63	Kawardha	798	72,820	2,77,000	4
64	Chhuikhadan	153	31,668	1,12,000	3
65	Changbhakar	906	23,322	47,000	2

PART V. STATES IN CENTRAL INDIA

66	Khaniadhana	100	17,670	48,000	3
67	Sarila	35	6,022	88,000	15
68	Beri	32	4,299	36,000	9
69	Bihat	16	4,565	28,000	6
70	Garranli	39	4,965	41,000	8
71	Gaurihar	71	9,713	62,000	6
72	Banka-Pahari	5	1,316	6,000	4
73	Bijna	8	1,567	10,000	6
74	Dhurivai	15	2,030	16,000	8
75	Tori-Fatehpur	36	5,597	31,000	5
76	Jigni	18	3,652	19,000	5
77	Lugosi	45	6,192	32,000	5
78	Alipura	73	15,316	90,000	6
79	Naigawan-Rebai	12	2,352	17,000	6
80	Jaso	72	7,823	39,000	5
81	Kothi	169	21,424	70,000	3
82	Sohawal	257	42,192	1,42,000	4
83	Bhaisaumda	32	4,267	17,000	4
84	Pahra	27	3,496	20,000	6
85	Paldeo	53	8,457	39,000	5
86	Taraon	17	3,387	20,000	6
87	Kamta-Rajunla	13	1,114	9,500	8
88	Muhammadgarh	29	2,658	16,000	6
89	Piploda	73	9,627	1,13,000	11
90	Jobat	131	20,152	82,000	4
91	Kathiwara	70	6,096	45,000	8
92	Mathwar	129	2,897	14,000	5
93	Ratanmal	32	2,183	25,000	11
94	Makrai	155	15,519	1,15,000	7

Confidential

Appx II to Mtgs

A SCHEME

for

The Establishment of The United States of Bundelkhand

by

Sir Vir Singh Dev K. C. S. I. Maharaja of Orchha

INTRODUCTION

Indian States stand at the cross-roads today. The growing socialistic concept of the State, the ever-increasing standard of living and the conquest of man over time and space have all elfetively contributed towards the changed out-look of humanity. The Social, Economic and Political needs of the people are growing every day and so are the demands on the efficacy of the State to meet them. The wave of individual consciousness, assisted by the spread of education and exaggerated to no less a degree by the Political ideologies at present gaining ground all over the country is sapping the foundations of many an age long Institution. These dynamic forces-evolutionary and revolutionary-have precipitated a state of affairs where we are obliged to cry halt and see if all is well with us.

On the other hand, during a century of peace and isolation, our strength and self-confidence have degenerated and our Political out-look has been narrowed down to the rigid conservatism which looks with alarm to any suggestion for change in our institutions. We have been over-taken by a belief that our Order shall best be preserved in our rigidly adhering to our past and in rejecting any proposal that may seem to militate against our notions of Soverignity. It is, therefore, no surprise that un-abating criticism is being levelled against our inadaptability and unprogressive out look.

Are we to submit ungracefully before this challange ? Shall we continue to stand at the cross-roads and allow ourselves to be over-thrown by the rising tide of time against the rock of our own conservatism and isoated self-satisfaction ? Are we to go down in History as those who failed to read the signs of time and who, for their inadaptability, were lost into oblivion ? If human mind can fore-see the future with any degree of accurancy, I, for one, would insist that the time has come when we should take up this challenge in right earnest. The Monarchical India has always been adaptable to the needs of time. Were it not so, the History of India would have been different, from what it is today. Have not the interests of our people been really upper-most in our minds and have we not, therefore, made sacrifice in the past which we may well look back upon with pride and satisfaction ? Has not our Order produced wise Rulers of men, great Empire builders, and States-men of eminence in the past ? Is not their blood running in our veins today ? Why can we not, therefore, get rid of our inferiority complex and be prepared to face the realities of the situation with courage and determination. Personally, I have every faith in the inherent capability of our Order and feel confident that we would not be found wanting in Political sagacity, which in these critical times, we are called upon to demonstrate to the world at large.

Inspired by my faith in the ultimate vindication of our monarchical system and in the statesmanship of our brother-Rulers, I have attempted, in the following lines to put forth a few suggestions touching some of the most important and vital issues of the moment. I crave the indulgence of my Brothers for the length and detail of my submission, for I feel that unless we are earnest and frank in analysing our present position, we shall not succeed in arriving at the correct solution of our problems.

While considering the course of our future political evolution, there are three factors which we have to keep in view. They may briefly be described as, (1) the policy of the Paramonnt Power (2) the strength and the programme of the Political Parties in British India, and (3) last, but not least in importance, the aspirations of our own subjects. No body need be shy of admitting that these three factors are the most effective elements that have, directly or indirectly, influenced the Political activities in the Indian States, and would also shape the future course of events that we may have to deal with. The attitude of the Paramount Power is apparent from the recent official utterances in Parliament, the address of His Excellency the Viceroy at the last session of the Chamber of Princes, and from the advice that we have lately been receiving from the Political Department. These are too recent to need any elaboration in any detail, but one thing, more than any other, which these successive declarations bring into prominence is that the Paramount Power does not consider the continuance of the present State of affairs in smaller States as conducive to the larger interests of India, including the Indian States. It is said and with some justification too. that so many small units. interpersed in between the British Provinces, exercising varying degrees of political independence, constitute serious obstacle to the successful working of any economic or Political scheme on national lines. It is to remove such barriers in the uniform progress of the country that the scheme of an All-India Federation contemplets the delegation by the Princes of certain powers to the future Fedral Government. Even as it is, the States of Bundelkhand are not regarded as individually capabale of maintaining an efficient Policeand Judiciary the two chief insrtuments of internal Peace and Order. The recognition of this fact has recently led the political authorities to suggest the adoption of co-operative measures in these branches of Administration. The need for these measurs has been described as "Urgent" and our "Immediate Attention" has been invited to them.

Coming to the attitude of the political parties in British India towards the Indian States, we all know that there exist varying shades of opinion, differing only in their degrees of opposition to our present system of autocratic Rule in the States. There are the extremists-and they are fairly large in proportion-who consider the existence of Indian States as an anachronism of the 20th century and would be satisfied with nothing short of complete liquidation of the whole system. There is then, a more moderate section of opinion which insists on an early establishment of responsible Government in the States under the aegis of their Rulers. There are also other points of view, but it can be said, without risk of contradiction that no party is willing to accomodate the Rulers as they are, and every shade of opinion agrees in demanding at least increasing association of the subjects with the Administration of States.

Some of the Political parties in British India are not content merely with the enunciation of their attitude towards the States; they have persistently resorted to varying methods of propaganda within the states to weaken the authority of the Rulers and to incite disaffection in the people against them. The unfortunate consequences of this exploitation of States subjects by the Political ideologists of British India are none too flattering to be re-counted here. Suffice it to say that inspite of every step taken,including the assistanceof the Paramount Power, many a Ruler of the States, specially the small States, have occasionally found themselves between the devil and the deep sea. There are no signs as yet to justify a belief that the political passion in British India against the States would cool down in the near future. On the other hand, there are reasons to fear that, with the growth of their power in British Provinces, the agitation against the States would intensify. Along with this intensification of opposition against us, the position of the Paramount Power, vis-a-vis the Indian States, is likely to become more critical, for, as a matter or political expediency, they might balance the weight of arguments on both sides against the perspective of their Home politics and the Internationl situation. These considerations, therefore, do very forcefully bring out the necessity for some sort of organisation amongst the States infer-se which may give us the self-sufficiency required for our internal progress, as well as, enable us to vindicate the strength of our system before those who may be ranged against us.

This brings us to our own subjects without whose co-operation no effective and lasting organisation can be possible. It is true that the loyalty of the State subjects towards their Rulers is proverbial. The person of the Ruler is still to some xtent sanctum-sanctorum for them, and they look upon the Princes as almost divine in origin But these encouraging features, however prominent in Indian States, should not blind us to our obvious duties towards them, nor should we allow this argument to be stretched too far. Leaving a side the repurcussions that the outside progress and propaganda have had on our people, it cannot be gain-said that the demands for a fuller realization of their aspirations are growing fast. They would, for example, be perfectly justified in claiming from there Masters facilities like those which their brethren at the next door are enjoying in British India. Why should not the States provide suitable education for their children, hospitals for their sick, canals for their land and employment for their growing youth ? Why should the subjects of a State be deprived of the benefit of railways, telegraphs, industrial developments and trade faciliteis ? And lastly, why should they not have the machineryfor the ventilation and redress of their just grievances ? Are we always to deny these privileges to our people and to use repression to supress these claims, or merely to ignore all these facts and rest content with our peoples' faith in our Divine origin ?

We have now analysed our position vis-a-vis the Paramount Power, the political parties of British India, and our own people. It is now for us to find out, before it is too late, as to what course should be adopted for our future political evolution. For my own part. I have been pondering over the situation for some time past, and would venture to place before you the conclusions that I have been able to arrive at.

The History of the origin and growth of all human institutions can be traced back to the needs and requirements of the moment from time to time. This is equally true of the Political and Constitutional history of any given country. Human needs are not static, nor or they alike all over the world at any given time, and, this is why no two constitutions of the word are identical, nor has any constitution, howsoever ably framed, remained unchanged for ever. Obviously therefore, we cannot feel ourselves wedded to any one form of Government, by whatever fascinating name it may be called. The aim and object of all constitutions is to provide for the stablity of the society side by side with the growth and development of the personality of the individual. So long as these essential conditions are fulfilled with due regard to the local needs and circumstances, there need be no anxiety as to whether our constitution does or does not conform to any prevalent forms of Government. But adaptation to the environments is essential In fact, it is one of the fundamental laws of survival and is applicable to human institutions, as well as to all organic and in-organic substances on the earth. For our own purpose we have analysed above the environments we are living in, as also the trend of changes that we may have to adopt in the future. What then is our duty towards ourselves, our Order, and our heritage ? How are we going to maintain our position as benvolent Rulers of our subjects and our prestige as leaders or men ? To my mind, two important conclusions emerge out of the above analysis. We should in the first instance, expand our resources with a view to equipping ourselves with the most efficient and most useful machinery of Administration to justify the claim as to benevolence. And secondly, in order to continue to be the true leaders of men we should acquire greater knowledge of our subjects by drawing them closer to our Governmental institutions and to our responsibilities. If these two conditions are satisfied, we shall easily be in a position to meet any challange from any quarter whatever.

But when we turn our attention to the actual process by which we may bring about an expansion of our resources, and increasingly associate our pople with the administration, real and practical difficulties seem to arise. It is obvious that inspite of every good intention on our part to be benevolent to our subjects, we cannot, for the sheer smallness of our size, provide for their expanding needs. Our individual economic potentialities are much too limited, and even where they exist it is not within the financial competence of an individual Ruler to develop them to their fullest advantage. The margin of taxation on land is hardly worth expansion at present, rather, there are possibilities that we may be called upon to reduce the present incidence of taxation. Where can we, therefore, look for the expansion of our resources ?

After mature thinking I have come to the conclusion that the only chance lies in our agreeing to pool our resources in one Central Fund and to utilize it in such a way as may give us the benefit of increasing return. This will avoid the wastage due to multiplicity of improvised institutions and would bring about efficiency with economy under which each one of us will be stronger than what he is today.

Such a pooling of resources as I have contemplated above will necessarily require pooling of individual powers and the exercise thereof through a common machinery. I have, therefore, drawn up a Scheme for the constitution of a larger State comprising of all States (Salute and non-Salute) of the whole of Bundelkhand agency to be known as the 'United States of Bundelkhand" (U.S.B.) Under the scheme all Rights, Authority and Jurisdiction pertaining to the Government of the Union shall vest in a Chamber of all Rulers of Bundelkhand, and an Executive Council of 3 to 5 Rulers (with a President elected by the Chamber itself and a Deputy President) shall exercise all executive powers in the union, all matters of policy being laid down by the Chamber. For legislative purposes, there shall be, in addition to the Council of Rulers, a Peoples' Assembly to consist of a majority of elected members with other members to be nominated by the Executive Council. This Union Parliament shall make laws for the peace, Order and good Government of the U.S.B. but our relations with the Crown, the Royal family and the Government of India, the fixation of the privy purse and such other matters shall be reserved only for the Rulers' Chamber. All Revenues, receivable from whatever sources, shall from part of the Union Fund and the privy purse and special expenditure of each Ruler shall be determined by the Council of Rulers on principles enunciated in detail in the appended constitution. The financial liabilities, chargeable to the public revenues of any State before the Union, shall become the liabilities of the Union. By an agreement with the Crown all matters arising out of our treaties, Sanads and obligations, except those in regard to which the Crown, may reserve the right of direct dealings with the Ruler, shall in future, be dealt with by the Executive Council on behalf of each Prince. Our attitude towords Federation shall be determined by the Chamber of Rulers, and in the event of our deciding to join the scheme of the All-India Federation, a single Instrument of Accession shall be executed by the Union and we shall join the Federation as one State.

The Executive Council of Rulers shall appoint Ministers, High Court Judges and members of the Public Service Commission that may be required to carry on the administration of the Union For other services, the Public Service Commission shall conduct examinations where necessary and make recommendations to the Ministers regarding the irappointment. The Cabinet of the Ministers would jointly and severally be responsible to the Rulers' Chamber through the executive Council and the President who alone will deal with them direct.

The Union shall not be dissolved unless after 10 years and then only after the passing of a resolution to that effect, at a special meeting of the Rulers' Chamber called for the purpose, with a majority of over 66 p. c. of all Rulers and 75 p. c. of those present at the meeting.

This, in short is the outline of the Scheme whereby I am contemplating to bring about real and substantial unity between the Rulers of Bundelkhand. It would be presumptous on my part to imagine that the scheme is perfect or that there is no room for improvement or criticism. To some it may appear too revolutionery or even suicidal, but a little reflection would show that it is really nothing of the kind. Unity implies some sacrifice and if we are willing to make a sacrifice of our petty personal intersts, we are sure to enjoy greater authority over a wider area with good prospects of perpetuating a more enlightened rule to the advantage of ourselves and our people. The adoption of this Scheme would obviate reasonable criticism against us and would enable the Paramount Power to extend its helping hand to us to its utmost

This brings me to yet another delicate point which has recently formed the subject matter of keen controversy amoungs us. I refer to the question of Sovereignty of Rulers. The Rulers have of late shown considerable anxiety to see that nothing is done which may impair their sovereign rights within the States and their extra territorial rights. In the formation of the contemplated Union, perhaps the question of Sovereignty may again loom large in our minds, and it is, therefore, necessary that we might examine this question frankly and dispassionately among ourselves As we all know, we have ceded all rights to deal direct with any foreign power and our territories do not admit of any expansion now. Even within our States we have hardly any independence in matters like Succession, adoption and many others. Gradually and imperceptly, either by consent or through political practice, our freedom in matters of economic and financial policy has also become much too limited, and although the laws of British India have no direct application in our States, we have been in many cases drawn up in line with them. And then there is the Scheme of All India Federation which requires the delegation of our Sovereign Powers in many cases to the future Federal Government. Is it, there fore, not a fact that we have not the substance but the shadow of Sovereignty now left with us, and even that is on the sufferance of the Paramount Power What then is the Sovoreignty which we are so anxious to preserve ? What is the sanction behind our rule in the States. Perhaps, in answer, we would refer to our treaties and the obligation of the Crown to maintain us on our thrones. Constitutionally and legally speaking this may be true, but from our experience in the past, it should be quite clear to us that the real and lasting sanction behind our powers in our territories, the true and stable safeguard for the preservation of our heritage, lies in the contentment and happiness of our own subjects. There can be no two opinions about this, and he who denies this truth dwells in his own world of unrealities.

Let us, therefore, not fail to realize that our own exitence and with it our claim to Sovereignty and Power, is directly dependent upon our ability to cater to the needs of our subjects and keeping them contented. We have to stand on our own legs, and shall we then fail to take the right step to avoid the threatened fall ? Is it, therefore, not necessary and prudent that we ignore our time-worn shibboleths, over-ride our sentiments and do the utmost in our power to pave the way for the stability of our bonds with our people ? No sacrifice would he too great to be made to attain this object, and I would sincerely appeal to my brothers seriously to consider the desirability of pooling our resources as one State under one Government for bringing about real efficiency in our administration to the betterment and happiness of our people. It cannot be too strongly urged that the political firmament is strewn with many an evil star, and unless we strive to proceed with courage and determination the opportunity now before us may be lost to our detriment for ever.

In the end, I would strongly commend the enclosed Union Scheme to the earnest consideration of my brother Rulers. Let me hope and pray that our concerted efforts may be rewarded with a solution satisfactory to ourselves and our subjects.

May God help us.

Vir Singh Dev

Tikamgarh C. I.
June 3, 1939

A Scheme for the Establishment of the United States of Bundelkhand

---

CONTENTS

I. Preliminary 1-3 Sections
II. Executive Powers 4-9 ,,
III. Legislative Powers 10-36 ,,
IV. Judicial Powers 37-49 ,,
V. Administrative Powers 50-57 ,,
VI. Public Service Commission 58-63 ,,
VII. Union Funds & Financial Liabilities 64-72 ,,
VIII. Relations with the Crown & the Government of India. 73-74 ,,
IX. Secession from the Union 75 ,,
X. Revision of the Constitution of Union. 76 ,,
XI. Special Provisions 77 ,,

SCHEDULES

1. Schedule...A	Voting Strength
2. Schedule...B	Members of the Peoples Assembly.
3. Schedule...C	Allocation of Revenues towards the Privy Purse, & State Requisites.
4. Schedule...D	Abstract of Receipt & expenditure.
5. Schedule...E	Rough budget for Expenditure

THE UNITED STATES OF BUNDELKHAND

CONSTITUTION

THE PRE-AMBLE

Whereas the Rulers of States (Salute and non-Salute) at present included in the Agency of Bundelkhand, have agreed of their own free will to unite as one State under the Paramount Power of the British Crown;

And Whereas it is believed that such Union would conduce to the welfare and future progress of the people;

And Whereas it is the wish and pleasure of the Rulers of these aforesaid States that their subjects be also associated with the Government of the Union;

And Whereas it is expedient to define the lines on which the Executive, Legislative and Judicial powers are to be exercised in the Government of the Union;

Be it, therefore, laid down, with the full concurrence and unanimous agreement of the aforesaid Rulers, as below:—

PRELIMINARY

1. The Union shall be styled as the "United States of Bundelkhand." (U S.B.)

2. In this constitution, unless otherwise specified, Rulers shall be taken to mean all the Rulers (Salute and non-Salute) at present included in the Bundelkhand Agency, and the "Union" shall mean the United States of Bundelkhand as herein constituted.

3. The Constitution of the Union shall be approved by a Convention of the Rulers, and the Union shall come into being on any date to be fixed within Six months after its recognition by His Excellency the Crown Representative on behalf of His Majesty the King Emperor

EXECUTIVE POWERS

4. The administration of the U. S. B. shall be conducted under a Rulers' Chamber, assisted by a Peoples' Assembly. The Rulers' Chamber shall consist of all the Rulers of Bundelkhand, in

which shall vest all Rights, Authority and Jurisdiction appertaining to or incidental to the Government of the Union, the Individual Rulers retaining their parsonal status and dignities in tact. This shall be a permanent body, with a Voting strength of 96 (Vide Schedule A).

5. There shall be established an Executive Council of three to five Rulers' including the President and the Vice-President, to be elected by the Rulers' Chamber.

6. The Executive Council shall exercise, on behalf of the Rulers' Chamber, all Executive and administrative powers in the Union, the Chamber laying down rules of policy and exercising general supervision only.

7. The President and Deputy-President of the Rulers' Chamber and the Executive Council shall be elected by the Rulers' Chamber, for five years at a time. The President will be expected to reside at the headquarters of the Union and carry on day to day administration with the help of the Cabinet of Ministers.

8. The President and the Deputy-President can be removed, during the currency of their term of Office, if a resolution to this effect is passed at a special meeting of the Chamber called for the purpose, with a majority of over 66 p. c of all Rulers and 75 p. c. of those present at the meeting.

Note:—The Deputy-President shall carry on President's duties in his absence.

9. Members of the Executive Council shall be eligible for re-election, but a person who has been in Office as President or Deputy President for two consecutive terms, shall not be eligible for re-election as such for the third time in succession. So for as possible all Members of Rulers' Chamber capable of undertaking the work shall have chance of serving on the Executive Council at least once every 10 or 15 years, while one member must always hail from the Rulers of non-Salute States.

LEGISLATIVE POWERS

10. The Union Parliament shall consist of 2 Houses The Rulers' Chamber and the Peoples Assembly The Peoples Assembly shall elect its own Speaker and a Deputy-Speaker, who shall act for the Speaker in his absence. The President and Deputy-President of the Rulers' Chamber shall also be the Speaker and Deputy-Speaker of the Rulers' Chamber.

11. The Rulers' Chamber shall consist of all the Rulers of the Bundelkhand Agency (Salute and non-Salute) Their voting strength

shall be 96 as per details entered in Schedule A. The Speaker will have a Second (Casting) Vote in case of a tie.

12. Unless otherwise specified in the body of this Constitution the presence of about one fourth of the total number of members shall constitute the Quorum in each House, and all decisions would be taken in accordance with the majority of votes. The proceedings shall not be deemed vitiated if a few Seats (upto 5 in the Rulers' Chamber and 10 in the Lower House) remain vacant by death or other reasonable cause at any time, provided that steps must be taken to fill them up within six months of the occurrence of a vacancy.

There shall be no quorum for the Executive Council and the Cabinet of Ministers, provided that the presence of the President or Deputy President is necessary at meetings of the Executive Council. The Premier shall attend its meetings as Secretary but shall have no vote.

13. The Speaker shall adjourn the House for want of quorm but he may, in his discretion, refuse to do so if there is no quorum for the third time provided that an interval of at least 15 days has elasped between the first and second adjournment as well as between the dates fixed for the 2nd and 3rd meetings, and at least one week's previous notice has been issued on each occasion.

14 The total area of the Union shall be divided into 77 constituencies as per details in Schedule A. each constituency electing one member by Adult Franchise and Secret Ballot. There shall be 50 to 70 nominated members as in schedule B making a total of 127 to 147 members in all.

15. The Ministers shall have the right to address the Rulers' Chamber.

16. The budget proposals shall be framed by the Cabinet at least three months before the commencement of the next financial year and placed before the Executive Council which, after discussing and passing them, shall send the revised proposals to the Peoples' Assembly within 15 days. The latter shall discuss the proposals and forward them to the Rulers' Chamber with their own recommendations within three weeks of their receipt. The whole thing shall be discussed by the Rulers' Chamber which shall forward it. with their own views. to the Executive Council within 15 days. The latter shall then review the proposals, as revised by the Two Houses, with the help of the Ministers and then pass final orders laying down the Budget for the next year, at least 15 days before the commencement of the next financial year. The final budget must reach the Heads of Departments and other concerned at least a week before the commencement of the financial year.

17. The following items of the Budget statement shall not be voted upon in the Peoples' Assembly:-

1. Expenditure for the maintenance of the Rulers' Chamber and the Executive Council.
2. Privy Purse and State requisites of the Rulers.
3. Salaries of the servants of the Union.
4. Any expenditure required to meet the Rulers' obligations to the Crown.
5. Expenditure to meet the financial liabilities of the Pre-Union times.

18. Resolutions, as passed by either House shall be considered by the Executive Council with the help of the Ministers, and the Council alone shall take final decisions there on which must be given effect to by the Ministers, in due course. At the end of the year, the premier shall issue a statement incorporating the resolutions passed by either House and the action taken thereon by order of the Executive Council; this statment shall be laid on the table of both the Houses and be available for sale to the public at a reasonable price.

19. A member of either House can put questions to the ministers who will, so far as reasonable and possible in public interest, answer them there and then or after obtaining facts and figures from their subordinates.

20. No Resolution or question can be permitted in respect of matters referred to in Section 17, except on eitem 3 there-under or of any other matter which is specifically disallowed by the speaker.

21. The lower House shall with the approval of the Executive Council, prepare its own Rules and Regulations for the conduct of its Elections and Proceedings of the House. The Upper House shall frame its own Rules and Regulations relating to its proceedings.

22. The Union shall have full powers to make laws for the peace, order, and good Government of the U. S. B. subject to the assent of H. H. the President to each Bill before it becomes an Act of Bundelkhand, until they are repealed, modified or replaced by ther U. S. B. Legislature.

23. The President of the Executive Council may appoint such dates and time for holding the Sessions or each House as he thinks fit, and may also, from time to time, prorogue the Peoples' Assembly and may, in like manner, dissolve the Assembly with the previous approval and sanction of the Ruler's Chamber.

24. The first Session of each House shall be held not later than six months after the establishment of the Union.

25. The laws in U. P. except Tenancy and the Revenue Law, shall be deemed to be in force in U. S. B. besides any special laws in force in various States.

26. There shall be at least two Sessions of each House in a year so that a period of more than eight months shall not intervene between two meetings or the House at any time, so far as possible. The Executive Council should meet at least once every month.

27. A Bill may originate from either House with the previous assent of the speaker, but no Bill or Resolution or address on the following subjects shall originate from the Peoples' Assembly or any such question put therein without the previous sanction of Executive Council.

(i) The Relations of the Rulers towards the Paramount Power or any other Power outside the Union.

(ii) Matters connected with the person of a Ruler or his family.

28. If a bill other than a money bill, is passed by the Peoples' Assembly in three Sessions and the Rulers' Chamber either rejects it every time, or fails to pass it, or passes it with amendments to which the peoples' Assembly do not agree, the President may, if he thinks fit, convene a joint sitting of both Houses within the term of the Peoples' Assembly and the Bill, as last proposed by the Peoples' Assembly, shall be discussed and voted upon by the members of the two Houses. The Bill as passed in the joint Session by a majority of members present, shall be taken to have been passed by both the Houses.

29. A Bill shall become law if it is passed by both the Houses and has received the assent of the President of the Executive Council. No such assent will however, be necessary, if a bill has been passed in each House by a majority of 66 p. c. votes. In giving or refusing his assent the President shall ordinarily act on the advice of the members of the Executive Council.

30. Subject to the provisions of Section 29, the Executive Council through its president, shall have the power to vote any bill that has been passed by both the Houses. In such cases he will return the Bill to the House of its origin within 15days or its having been passed, with such recommendations as he may deem fit, and the same shall be re-considered by the two Houses in due course. The Bill shall become law in the form in which it may be passed by a two-thirds majority of each House of Legislature, in such a case.

31. Every person, man or woman, shall be entitled to vote in the election for the Assembly if, he or she:

(i) has completed 18 years of age before the date the Electoral Roll is prepared, and

(ii) is a natural born subject of the Union or has permanently resided within the Union for the last 12 years or over, before the election, or

(iii) is a permanent employee of the Union.

32. Those going out of the U. S. B. on or in search of service, employment or profession and not severing their connections with their homes, shall be entitled to vote (as chaistuas and others).,

33. Every person who is entitled to a vote under sections 31 or 32 above, would be eligible for membership of the Assembly, provided he or she is over 21 years of age and can read and write Bundelkhandi with facility and ease. No person shall be eligible for election to the Assembly if he or she,

(i) is a lunatic or of un-sound mind or suffers from a loath-some and infectious disease, or some permanent infirmity rendering him incapble for the work of the Assembly, or

(ii) is a previous convict for some heinous offence involving moral terpitude, or

(iii) has been bound over under Sections 107, 110 of the Cr. P. C. to be of good behaviour, or

(iv) is an undischarged insolvent or,

(v) is in the paid service of the Union.

34. The seat of a member in the Peoples, Assembly shall become vacant if he or she–

(i) Dies or resigns, or

(ii) Becomes subject to any of the disabilities mentioned in section 33 above, or

(iii) Fails for a whole year to attend the Assembly without special leave of Speaker of the House,

35. There shall be freedom of speech in the Union Parliament and no member shall be liable to any proceedings in a Court for anything said or any vote given by him in the House or in any Committee there of and no person shall be so liable in respect of the publications, under the authority of the House, of any report, paper, votes or proceedings, provided that he or she does not use unparliamentary or u-becoming language in respect of His Majesty the King Emperor or His Excellency the Crown Representative, or any Indian Prince.

(ii) No member shall be liable to arrest within the Houses of the Legislature or its immediate precincts under any law of the Union or any order of a Court.

36 Subject to the approval of the Executive Council, each member of the Peoples' Assembly shall receive such monthly honorarium

or D. A. and T. A. as may be determined by a Resolution of the Peoples' Assembly. Members of the Rulers' Chamber and the Executive Council may also draw such T. A. & D. A. as may be determined by a resolution of the Rulers' chamber.

JUDICIAL POWERS

37 There shall be established a High court for the U. S. B. consisting of one chief Judge and as many Puisne Judges as may be found necessary. It shall exercise all powers af a High court under the codes of civil & criminal Procedure and other laws of the Union. It shall be directly under the Rulers' Executive Council and quite independent of the Cabinet of Ministers, Its decisions in all Judicial matters, Civil and Criminal shall be final so far as the U. S. B. is concerned.

38. All Courts of the Union (Civil and Criminal) shall be subordinate to the High Court which shall exercise such appelate and Revisional Powers over them as may be prescribed under any law of the Union. The High Court shall be a Court of Reference alto.

39. The Judges of the High Court shall be appointed by the Executive Council on such terms as they deem fit, but their pay shall range from Rs. 600 to Rs. 1500 p. m. while no Judge of the said High Court shall hold Office after the age of 65 years.

40. The High Court shall exercise the powers of superintendence over all Courts of the Union and shall, from time to time make rules for the conduct of the Judicial work in the Courts.

41. The High Court shall also be empowered to make rules for the en-rolment of legal practitioners in the Union.

42. The Chief Judge of the High Court, acting with a Puisne Judge, shall promote, transfer, and grant leave to the Subordinate Judicial Officers.

43. The Chief Judge shall be an-Officio member of the Public Service Commission.

44. The President of the Executive Council may refer for the opinion of the High court, any question relating to the interpretation of the Constitution of the Union or any other matter which the President in his discretion may deem fit to be so referred. The opinion of the High Court under this Section shall not be binding on the President.

45. Subject to the provisions of age-limit under section 39 above, no Judge of the High court shall be removed from his office except on the ground of misbehaviour or of infirmity of mind or body if, on a reference being made to the Executive Council by the President, a

Resolution is passed that a Judge ought, on any such ground, to be removed.

46 The Executive Council of Rulers may exercise the prerogative of mercy, in cases where any person has been sentenced to death and is recommended for Mercy by the High court.

47 All Civil Appeals of the valuation of Rs. 5000 or above and all criminal appeals against an award of 5 years R. I. or over, shall be heard by a bench of at leat two Judges In cases of difference of opinion between the Judges, the opinion of the chief Judge shall prevail.

48 only in cases, specifically mentioned in any law of the Union, an appeal against the Order and Judgment of a single Judge of the High Court shall lie to the full bench.

49 The High Court shall exercise original Jurisdiction in such cases as may be specified in any law passed by the U. S. B. Legislature.

ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS

50 For the purpose of carrying on the administration of the Union, the Executive Council of Rulers shall, in consultation with Ministers appoint such Heads of Departments and other Officials as may be considered necessary. The Council may delegate such of its powers of appointment as it thinks fit to the Cabinet of Ministers who shall exercise them in consultation with the Public Service Commission as may be laid down by rules in this behalf. A Civil and Military Services Regulations shall be framed by the Cabinet in consultation with the Public Service Commission and the approval of the Executive Council.

51 There shall be a Premier who will be responsible for the Co-ordination of the work of the several Ministers and shall preside at the meetings of the Cabinet of Ministers. They shall be responsible to the Executive Council but work directly under the control of the President alone.

52 All Ministers of the Union shall be ex-officio members of the Peoples' Assembly and be entitled to introduce Bills and Resolutions in the Assembly. They shall be entitled to address the Rulers' Chamber and Council and also the Executive Council, if invited by the President, but will not have the right to vote

53 The Ministers shall be responsible for their policy to the Executive Council, but each Minister shall be individually responsible to the President for his conduct in the discharge of his duties. The Minister shall hold their Office during the pleasure of the Executive Council.

54 The salaries of Ministers and the terms of their appointment shall be determined by a resolution of the Executive Council, but usually they will draw a salary of Rs. 700 to Rs. 2000 p. m.

55. All matter relating to the promotion, leave transfer and discipline of the Union servants, drawing a salary not exceeding Rs. 100 p. m. shall be dealt with by the Minister concerned. They may delegate any of such powers to the heads of Departments and others with the approval of the President of the Executive Council. In case of higher Officers, the President of the Executive Council shall deal with them.

56. No Court shall have the power to enquire into any administrative or legislative matters connected with the duties of Rulers' Chamber, the Executive Council, the Ministers and the House of the Legislature.

57. All other Executive services shall be directly under the Ministers, in-charge of the various departments and to their own departmental Officers, while Officers, and men of the Judicial services shall work under the High Court and their respective departmental officers. In cases of doubt, the President of the Executive Council shall decide the question.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMISSION

58. There shall be constituted a Public Service Commission for the Union consisting of a Chairman and 2 other members and a Secretary.

59. The Premier shall usually be the Chairman of the Public Service Commission and the Chief Judge of the High Court shall be an ex-officio member of the commission. The 3rd member shall be elected for every five years by the Peoples' Assembly from amongst its members.

60 The Secretary of the Commission shall be appointed by the Chairman in his own discretion and shall be charged with such duties as the Commission may entrust him with.

61. Subject to the provisions of Sections 50 & 55 above the Commission shall conduct examinations for appointment to the services of the Union, or may select them after interviews only as may be decided by the Executive Council. The Public Service Commission shall recommend suitable candidates numbering 2 or 3 for every vacancy that has to be filled up, and the final appointment shall rest in the hands of the Cabinet, with the approval of the President of the Executive Council when necessary.

62. The Public Service Commission shall decide with the approval of the Cabinet.

(i) All matters relating to the methods of recruitment to services under the Union.

(ii) The principles to be followed in making appointments to Civil services and in making promotions, and transfers from one service to the other.

(iii) All disciplinary matters against the servants of the Union drawing salary exceeding Rs. 100 p. m. and below the rank of Heads of Departments and

(iv) give advise on any other matter relating to Public Services which the Executive Council of the Cabinet of Ministers may refer to it.

63. The non-Official member of the Commission shall receive such salary and allowances as the Executive Council of Rulers may determine. The spade work shall be done by the Secretary under his supervision. The Examiners appointed by the Commission shall be paid such honorarian as may be fixed by the Commission who shall have the power of prescribing fees payable by the candidates for competition, so as to cover the honoraria and other incidental charges.

UNION FUNDS & FINANCIAL LIABILITIES

64. Subject to the next following section, the Union Funds shall consist of all Revenues and Incomes receivable from any source whatever, by the States of Bundelkand on the date the Union comes into being.

65. The income, accruing to the Rulers from their personal assets, either within the Union or out-side it, or any other income, which in future, may become so receivable shall not form part of Union Fund and will continue to be collected and appropriated by the Rulers. Rulers can dispose of their personal assets and investments, excepting their Palaces and ancestral jewellery.

66. A Privy Purse and Funds for State Requisites shall be allotted to each Ruler on the following Scale:-

States with total Receipts of	8 lakhs & over	20 p. c.
,, ,, ,,	5 ,, ..	22·5 p. c.
,, ,, ,,	3 ,, ..	25 p. c.
,, ,, ,,	1 ,, ..	27·5 p. c.
,, ,, ..	50,000 ..	30 p. c.
,, ,, ,,	25,000 ..	32 p. c.
,, ,, ..	under 25,000 p. c.	33·3 p. c.

Some extra-ordinary items, which may by terned States Requisites, on which special expenditure is necessary as we happen to be Rulers of States or Indian Princes, shall also be excluded from the

N

Union and continue to be directly looked after by ourselves, such as the Guest House, State Garage (as distinguished from our own Garage) and other conveyances, Palace Guards and Nakibs, Rulers Official tours, marriages in his family, Ceremonials, gardens and the like. A reasonable percentage of the States Revenues, say from 15 to 16·7 p. c. may be allotted to these special expenses, reserving between 35 to 50 p. c. of the total Receipts of States (big and small) at the disposal of Rulers, and releasing the remaining 65 to 50 p. c. for being pooled together into one common fund to meet the requirements of all the United States for their administration (Vide Schedule C.)

67. All Financial Liabilities arising out of any contract, loan, investments or agreement, made before the close of the year 1939 and not being entirely personal in character, shall with effect from the date the Union comes into being, be treated as if they were liabilities incurred by the Union. (They may well be assumed to be somewhere in the neighbourhood of Rs. 25 to 35 lacs in all).

68. Any Civil Suit or action by or against a State, pending on or before the date the Union comes into being, whether within or outside the Union, shall be taken up and dealt with as if it was a suit or action by or against the Union.

69. There shall be an Auditor-General for the Union who shall be appointed by the Executive Council and shall be removable on the grounds of mis-behaviour or of infirmity of mind or body, if on reference being made to the Rulers' Chamber by the President, a Resolution is passed that the Auditor-General ought, on any such ground, to be removed.

70. The Accounts of the Union shall be kept in such form as may be jointly determined by the Accountant General and the Auditor-General. The latter shall Audit the accounts of the Union and submit annually a report relating to the accurancy and reasonability of the accounts which shall be placed before the Cabinet of Ministers who shall take necessary action thereon and submit the report with its Resolution before the President of the Executive Council and the two Houses of Legislature for information and necessary action.

71. The total estimated Receipts of the U. S. B. are likely to be about Rs 90,00,000 (Rs. 78 lakhs real PLUS Rs. 15 lakhs under Suspense Head and less Rs3 lakhs for un-realized arrears. Vide Schedule D.) The total estimated expenses are similarly likely to be about Rs. 90,00,000 (as per rough Budget Vide Schedule E.)

72. The old liabilities being about Rs. 25 to 33 lakhs, we shall require a new loan of Rs. 75 lakhs at 4 p. c. p. a. repayable in 40 year's time. The old liabilities would thus be liquidated, leaving about Rs. 40 to 50 lakhs which would meet the requirements of our Civil

and Military buildings (Secretariat, Courts, Offices, Barracks, Quarters etc.) arms, equipments (for the Army and Police) Roads, Irrigation works etc.

RELATIONS WITH THE CROWN & THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

73. Excepting such matters in which the British Crown may, by agreement with the Union, reserve its right to deal direct with any Ruler, the Union shall act on behalf of all Rulers in matters appertaining to the Rights and obligations arising out of any Treaty, Sanad, Engagement or political practice.

74. In the matter of an All India Federation, as envisaged in the Government of India Act 1935, negotiations with the Crown shall be carried on, on behalf of the Union and the Rulers' Chamber, by the Executive Council, and in the event of the said Council deciding to join the said All-India-Federation, there shall be executed a single Instrument of Accession on behalf of the Union and the Rulers' Chamber with such limitations and reservations as may be agreed upon by the Executive Council and the Rulers' Chamber.

S~~UC~~ECESSION FROM THE UNION

75. The Union once established shall not be dissolved till at least after ten years and even then unless a resolution to that effect is passed at a special meeting of the Rulers' Chamber called for the purpose, with a majority of over 66 p. c. of all Rulers and over 75 p. c. of those present at the meeting and unless notice of this resolution is given to the Crown Representative at least 12 months before the resolution is proposed to be moved in the Council.

REVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION

76. Subject to the provisions of section 75 above, no bill for the revision of the Constitution of the Union shall be moved without the previous sanction of the Executive Council and the Rulers' Chamber and no such Bill shall become Law unless it is passed in both the Houses by a two thirds majority of the members present at the meeting.

77. SPECIAL PROVISIONS:—

(i) Rulers of Salute States, their concerts and Heir-apparent, Ministers and Judges of the High Court and others specially exempted by name by the Executive Council of Rulers, shall not be liable to arrest by the U. S. B. Police.

(ii) They shall be exempt from personal attendance in all Courts and Offices.

(iii) The Rulers shall continue to own their new and old Palaces and personal houses, whether within or outside the State, together with all moveable properties, Jewelleries etc., and their Titles and privileges shall continue in tact. No one shall have the power to reduce their Privy Purse and special expenditure referred to in Section 66 above.

(iv) Officials of States, who lose their posts due to the creation of the U. S B. shall if practicable be provided for in the Union Service, and those who cannot be so provided for shall be given suitable pensions, gratuities or other compensation so far as possible.

(v) Subordinate Jagirs shall be administered by the Union Officials as parts thereof, but the Receipts there-from shall, after deduction of the cost of administration be handed over to them. Rules shall be framed in this connection, but the Jagirdars shall continue to be subordinate to their respective Rulers while owing allegiance to the Union also, and shall be dealt with by the said Rulers as at present and not by the Union.

(vi) The States under administration of the Paramount Power on account of the minority of their Rulers or for any other reasons, may join the Union through the Paramount Power, subject to their willing continuance therein or not after they have attained majority or the restoration of administration to them.

(vii) Any Treasure trove, found in any State, shall be the exclusive property of its Ruler.

(viii) The Boundaries of the States shall be kept in tact.

Schedule A (Vide Sections 4 & 11 of the Constitution)

Voting Strength of Various States in the Rulers' Chamber & Peoples' Assembly

S. No.	Name of States	Population	Area in sq Miles	Revenues	Proposed Votes in Rlurers Assembly	Proposed Votes in Peoples' Assembly
1.	Orchha	3,14 Lakhs	2,080	13.8	12	10
2.	Datia	1,58 ..	912	13.6	12	6
3.	Samthar	33 ..	178	3.5	4	3
4.	Panna	2,12 ..	2,596	8.9	9	7
5.	Charkhari	1,20 ..	880	6.3	7	4
6.	Ajaigarh	86 ..	802	3.6	4	3
7.	Bijawar	1,15 ..	973	3.2	4	4
8.	Baoni	19 ..	121	1.5	2	2
9.	Chhatarpur	1,61 ..	1,130	9.3	9	6
10.	Baraundha	16 ..	218	.5	1	2
11.	Nagod	74 ..	591	2.3	3	3
12.	Maihra	61 ..	407	4.0	4	3
Total;	Salute States			70.5	71	53
13.	Alipura	15,316	73	90,000	2	2
14.	Kothi	21,424	169	70,000	2	2
15.	Sarila	6,022	33	92,000	2	1
16.	Sohawal	42,192	257	1,25,000	2	2
17.	Bankapahari	1,316	5	6,000	1	1
18.	Beri	4,2[illegible]9	32	32,000	1	1
19.	Bihat	4,585	16	28,000	1	1
20.	Bijna	1,567	8	10,000	1	1
21.	Bhaisonda	4,267	32	18,000	1	1
22.	Dhurwai	4,0[illegible]0	15	16,000	1	1
23.	Garrauli	4,965	39	36,000	1	1
24.	Gaurihar	9,713	7[illegible]	53,000	1	1
25.	Jaso	7,825	72	39,000	1	1
26	Jigni	3,652	18	17,000	1	1
27.	Kamta Rajola	1,114	13	9,000	1	1
28.	Lugasi	6,192	45	31,000	1	1
29.	Negwan Rebai	2,352	12	17,000	1	1
30.	Pahra	3,496	27	20,000	1	1
31.	Paldeo	8,457	53	39,000	1	1
32.	Taraon	3,387	17	21,000	1	1
33.	Tori-Fatehpur	5,597	36	32,000	1	1
Total:	Non-Salute States			8,01,000 + 70.50,000 78,51,000	25	14
GRAND TOTAL;	All States			78.2	96 votes in all	77 votes in all

SCHEDULE B.

VIDE SECTION 14

Number of Members in the Peoples' Assembly:-

1. Elected (as per Schedule A)			77	Members
2. Nominated	50	to	70	,,
(a) The Premier & the Ministers	5	to	7	
(b) Jagirdars of States	20	to	25	
(c) Backward Classes	10	to	15	
(d) Labouring Classes	10	to	15	
(e) Special interests	5	to	8	

GRAND TOTAL:- **127 to 147 in all**

SCHEDULE C.

ALLOCATION OF REVENUES TOWARDS THE PRIVY PURSE, STATE REQUISITES & THE UNION FUND

(Vide Section 66)

Name of States	Total Revenu Vide Agency list	Privy Purse in lakhs	State Requisites in lakhs	Total to be retained by each State	Contribution towards the Union
Orchha	13.8	2.76 at 20 persent	2.10 at 15 percent	4.86	8.94 at 65 percent
Datia	13.6	2.72 at 20 ,,	2.04 at 15 ,,	4.76	8.84 at 65 ,,
Samthar	3,5	.87 at 25 ,,	.54 at 15,5 ,,	1,41	2 09 at 59.5 ,,
Panna	8,9	1.78 at 20 ,,	1.38 at 15.5 ,,	3.16	5.74 at 64.5 ,,
Charkhari	6.3	1.42 at 2.25 ,,	.97 at 15.5 ,,	2.39	3.91 at 62 ,,
Ajaigarh	3.6	.90 at 25 ,,	.56 at 15.5 ,,	1.46	2.14 at 59.5 ,,
Bijawar	3.2	.80 at 25 ,,	.49 at 15.5 ,,	1.29	1.91 at 59.5 ,,
Baoni	1.5	.41 at 27 5 ,,	.24 at 16 ,,	.65	.85 at 56.5 ,,
Chhatarpur	9.3	1.86 at 20 ,,	1.44 at 15.5 ,,	3.30	6 00 at 64.5 ,,
Baraundha	.5	15 at 30 ,,	.08 at 16 ,,	.23	.27 at 54 –.
Nagod	2.3	.63 at 27.5 ,,	.36 at 15.5 ,,	.99	1.31 at 57 ,,
Maihra	4.0	1.00 at 25. ,,	.62 at 15.5 ,,	1.62	2.38 at 59.5 ,,
TOTAL	70.50	15.30	10.82	26.12	44 38 at 50 ,,
Non-Salute States	6·01			3·00	3·00 at 50 percent
GRAND TOTAL	76·51		29·12	29.12	47·38

SCHEDULE D.

I. CREDIT SIDE

(Estimated Receipts.)

1.	Land Revenue	52,00,000	Based on intelligent anticipation only
2.	Customs	8,00,000	
3.	Excise	4,00,000	
4.	Forests	5,00,000	
5.	Law & Justice	3,00,000	
6.	Miscellaneous	6,00,000	
	Total	78,00,000	(as per C. I. agency list.)
	Unrealized arrears	3,00,000	
	BALANCE	75,00,000	
	Suspense Headse		
7.	Jagirs	10,00,000	
8.	Advances adjusted of refunded	4,00,000	
9.	Deposits	1,00,000	
	GRAND TOTAL	90,00,000	

II. DEBIT SIDE

1.	Payable to Rulers for their Privy Purse	16,50,000
2.	,, ,, on account of States requisites.	12,80,000
3.	Expenditure on administration (as per budget.)	45,00,000
4	Suspense Heads	15,00,000
	GRAND TOTAL	89,30,000

SCHEDULE E,

III. BUDGET OF EXPENDITURE (Rs. 45 lakhs available)

1.	General Administration		1,21,000
2.	Revenue Department		7,14,500
3.	Police „		6,91,000
4.	Judicial „		1,70,000
5.	Army „		3,00,000
6.	Forest „		85,600
7.	Customs & Excise Deptt		83,600
8.	Accounts & Audit „		84,200
9.	Local-Self Government (Pounds, fairs etc., included)		1,00,000
10.	Registration & Stamps		27,000
11.	Medical & Sanitary (Veterinary included)		3,70,000
12.	Education department (V. K. S. Parishad included)		6,50,000
13.	Jail		1,88,000
14.	P. W. D. (Buildings, Roads & Irrigation)		2,00,000
15.	Legislative deptt.		57,000
16.	Publicity „		5,500
17.	Liabilities (about 25 to 35 lakhs old & 40 new.)		5,00,000
18.	Pensions & Gratuities		1,00,000
19.	Reserve		70,000
20.	Misc. (including arceaeology, Political)		32,600
		TOTAL	45,00,000
	SUSPENSE HEADS.		
21.	To States about Privy Purse		16,50,000
22.	„ about State requisites		12,80,000
23.	Jagirs (assumed)		10,00,000
24.	Advances		4,00,000
25.	Deposits		1,00,000
		GRAND TOTAL Expenditure.	89,30,000

To be kept in C.A.

SECRET.

KEEP.

Pol. Branch
Confidential
Almirah

FILE NO. 241-P(Secret)/45.

1945.

Entered in list

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

POLITICAL BRANCH.

Serial No. (1)-(15).

Subject:

Post-war position of Hyderabad.

2. Desire of the Hyderabad Government to obtain outlet to the sea.

****

Previous References.

File.No.80-P(S)/44.
File No.376-P(S)/42.
File No.344-P(S)/44.
File No.81-Fed.1./37.
File.No.27-Special(Secret)/1930.
File No.9(8)-P/40.
File No.13(19)-I1/45.

Indexed.

Secret.

(Extract from a note by Sir Francis Wylie-original in F. No. 30-F(S)/44.)

X X X

8. Along with "Berar" there will be another word graved on the heart of the Nizam when he jins his fathers-Masulipatam. Article 1 of a Commercial Treaty negotiated by the East India Company with the Nizam of Hyderabad in 1802 recites-

"As the testimony of the firm freindship, union and attachment subsisting ....the Hon'ble Company hereby agree to grant to His Highness the free use of the seaport of Masulipatam.........". The words "free use" in this Treaty have given us a whole lot of trouble. The Nizams Govt claim that the intention of the framers of the Treaty was to restore to Hyderabad an outlet to the sea and that the levy of British Indian sea customs on goods destined for the Nizam's Dominions and entering India by this port is a breach of the Treaty. They go further, they assert that the effect of this Treaty is to provide Hyderabad with the privilege of importing free of British Indian customs duties, through any port in Indian or overland from beyond British India, "all articles being the growth, produce or manufacture of any part of His Britannic Majesty's Dominions". Both these claims have been firmly rejected by His Majesty's Govt and the Govt of India. In their interpretation the words "free use" mean free transit only, transit without let or hinderance. Later in this note I shall have to mention the Hyderabad ambition to become an independent country in alliance with Great Britain and having as little as possible to do with the rest of India. In that connection a definite suggestion has been put out that if we have to "quit" the rest of Indiahere is an ideal pied a terre by which we could have access to our ally. In short the Hyderabadis (i.e. the governing clique) say "give us Masulipatam or some other outlet to the sea and all will be well". This suggestion is on a par with the Jam Sahib's crude idea - [illegible] when the Princes' deputation met H.E.

all

in September-that if we would only protect the Indian States so perpetuate the rule of the Indian Princes they on their part would go on buying "ironware and cheap tin trays" from us for ever.

X X X

14. Mr. Grigson in paragraph 14 of his long note puts the intriguing question hwat is to be the future of Hyderabad? Whatever the fate of the territories now included in the Nizam's Dominions may be I personally regard it as a complete chimera the suggestion that Hyderabad be elevated to the status of an independent State in perpetual alliance with Great Britain and severed from the rest of India. In case H.E. may be interested I may state in briefest outline my own beliefs on the subject. I believe first of all that if an Indian Union is achieved there will be a Federal unit in it ruled over by the Nizam of Hyderabad. This because the two main political parties in India will wish to compromise over the two important-between themselves-counterbalancing Indian States of Hyderabad and Kshmir. I believe on the other hand that no stable Indian Union will ever be achieved unless the map of India is redrawn and existing Provincial as well as State boundaries recast to correspond with some tangible local reality like geography, language, culture or religion. It is in my opinion inadequately recognised by our would-be constitution makers that if a Federal Union is established it will be the first time in history that a presently existing centralised Government has been given a federal shape. All other Federations known to history have coalesced from units previously independent of each other and so equipped with a local patriotism or at least a common economic bond of some kind. The units of the Indian Federation must be provided with somesuch bond if the component unit governments are to work let alone the central Federal Govt. itself. The only possible way to do this is to obliterate the existing

Provinces which are the chance creations of British administrators and the existing States, which owe their present shape to circumstances no less fortuitous, and to build the whole thing again on bases which have some correspondence with reality. On the tactical side the Royal Commission which would do all this -no body less reputable than a Royal Commission could do it-would take at least five years over the task. In that five years much might happen to deliver us all from the frustration and bitterness which are such depressing features of the present Indian scene while the distractions offered by the discussions which the whole question of new unit boundaries would generate might take people's minds off their present mostly barren discontents. Hyderabad is, as the linguistic map which I have placed with these papers discloses, a composite State. Out of it a Royal Commission might very well decide to carve a new State with its headquarters at Hyderabad. The new State might include all the Telugus of the Eastern Deccan and of the northern Circars viz all the eastern portion of the present Hyderabad State plus the Telugu districts of British India. Over this State the Nizams of Hyderabad would, if they are to rule at all, be set as constitutional Rulers only. One day or another the autocracy of the Nizams has quite certainly got to go.

X C X

Sd. F.V.Wylie.
17.11.44.

11

D.No.314-P(C)/45. (1)

"Pp"

Sd. C.L. Corfield,
24.8.45.

(1) [illegible]

(2) [illegible]

(3) By G. Br.

The Nawab of Chhatari's letter (1) of the 20th December 1942 will be found as enclosure to S.No.42 in F.No.376-P(S)/42. S.Nos. 43,45,46,48 and 50 in that file may also be read. In this connection attention is also invited to S.Nos.110,116 and 120 in (2) File No.344-P(S)/44.

File regarding War reward has been submitted (3) separately.

[illegible]
27/8/45

28/8/45

When speaking of recognition of services the Nawab of Chhatari may be thinking not only of titles etc. but also of the removal of controls. There has been a good deal of correspondence on this subject and in this connection Political Adviser may like to see s. no. 5 in file no.80-P(S)/44 and the noting on pages 6-8 notes of that file. The decision has been taken that there can be no relaxation during the present Nizam's lifetime.

flag J.

Removed

28. 8. 45.

~~Pol. Adv.~~

Thanks. Please issue reply below

29/8/45

I am sending copies privately to Resident

(2) Issue.

P.S.

29/8

Issue Dt. [illegible]

[illegible] 1 month

30/8/45

Secret

No.D.327-P(C)/45.

A copy of the Simon Commission Report is placed below. The Government of India's recommendation on the formation of a Council for Greater India will be found in paragraphs 64-61 ~~[illegible]~~ of their (1) Despatch No.7 of 1930 dated the 13th September 1930.

In this connection, Sir Bertrand Glancy's (2) note of the 22nd March 1937 on the interview granted by him to Sir Akbar Hydari and serial (3) No.16 in F.No.9(8)-P/40 may kindly be read. 69-70 of the Butler Committee Report may also be read.

(1) [illegible] 1930

(2) [illegible] 8) Pol I/37

(3) [illegible] F. 9(8) P/40

PK.
10.9.45

J.S.H. Shattock
10/9/45

10/9/45

P.S.

Pol. Secy.

10/9/45

Draft ~~Issue~~ d.o. below to the Resident at Hyderabad may issue, if H.E. approves.

11-9-45.

P.S.V.

H.E. approves

11/9/45

P.S.
A.S.I.
P 11/9

2175/AS
12/9/45

P.S.
A.S.I.
P 12/9

(4) ~~(2)~~ Issue

This file may again be sent to P.S.V. with reference to portion marked "A" at cor/p.5.

J.S.H. Shattock
13/9/45.

PK.
13/9/45

13/9/45

D.S.I.

P.S.

His Excellency may now see the correspondence immediately below.

2. Sir Arthur Lothian will be coming to Delhi with the Nawab of Chhatari at the end of this month, and I will record for His Excellency's information the purport of any discussion we have on the point raised.

Griffith
19-9-45.

PSV

HE has seen.

20/9/45

2337/45
19/9/45

KMC

7

D. No. 336-P(C)45 (S)

Submitted. An extract from the Secret file will be found at n Rs p 1-3 ante.

J. S. H. Shattock.
25/9/45.

17k.
25/9/45

D.S.I.
P/S.

I am very doubtful of the propriety of Mr Savidge - Acting Revenue and Police Member of the Hyderabad Government - being brought into controversial external issues of this kind. He is a Government servant lent by us to the Hyderabad Govt with the object of keeping the internal administration of the State on the right lines.

26. 9. 45.

Pol. Adviser

File No.376-P(S)/42
~~Slip K,~~
Ser.No.50

Sir Arthur Lothian agreed that Mr Savidge should be kept out of such discussions in future.

2. I have had a full discussion with the Nawab of Chhatari and Sir Arthur Lothian regarding the wish of Hyderabad to obtain an outlet to sea in order to secure its economic future.

3. The Nawab referred to Political Department letter No.376-P/42 dated the 25th June 1943, which stated that at the present stage of uncertainty as to the future no useful purpose would be served by attempting a detailed reply to the Hyderabad Government's ~~postwar~~ reactions to constitutional changes resulting from the Cripps' offer. The Nawab said that the time had now come to reconsider this letter in view of further constitutional discussions, which were now likely to take place.

4. The Nawab urged that Hyderabad had strong moral claims to special consideration not only because of its Treaty position but because of its past friendship and recent war services; ~~but~~ the State was most anxious to maintain its relationship with the Crown and considered that this maintenance was to the political advantage of both Britain and India. He anticipated that the Dominion of India, if it was established, would be anti-British and that the existence of a friendly Hyderabad would strengthen the Imperial position. He pointed out that the ceded districts had been handed over in return for protection and could not be transferred to any other authority without consent. In his view it was desirable both politically and strategically for the Crown to retain some area of control in India and made comparison between the position of Hyderabad in India and the Sudan vis-a-vis Egypt. He stated that Hyderabad was economically and historically a stable unit and it ~~is~~ was desirable to strengthen this stability by giving the State an outlet to the sea. This claim was strengthened by the terms of the 1802 Treaty# regarding Masulipatam, but ~~than~~ the present proposal was to approach the Portuguese Government with the object of purchasing the port of Goa. The State was anxious to elicit the support of His Majesty's Government for this approach and hoped that the Crown Representative would recommend it.

which gives Hyderabad the 'free use' of Masulipatam Port &c.

5. I suggested that any such approach to H.M.G. would be unfortunate. It would be interpreted as an attempt to strike a bargain in advance of forthcoming constitutional discussions, whereby Hyderabad would be placed in a position to stand out of an all-India scheme. This could hardly be viewed with favour by H.M.G., whose main object was to transfer all such negotiations to India and whose main hope was that this would lead to an all-India constitution. The proposal would be bound to leak out if any approach was made, and the reactions in India would be serious.

The Congress would interpret it as an attempt to disrupt India and to secure a permanent hegemony of a Muslim minority over a Hindu majority. The communal dangers were

[redacted]

Please see previous page. A draft to the India Office is placed below for H.E.'s approval.

[illegible] 18/10/45

PSV

HE approves.

[illegible] 19/10/45

[illegible] 20/10/45

(6) Issue

2611/AC
19/10/45

PS
~~DPSV~~ [illegible] 19/10
P 19/10

PS
~~DPSV~~ [illegible] 20/10
P 20/10

[illegible] 2 months

[illegible]
21/10/45

(External Affairs Department).

....

~~D.No.8961-FE/45.~~ ~~(1)~~. (2)

Pol. Deptt. to see.

Sd. R.R. Burnett.
30.10.45.

The first I have heard of this. The Portuguese would'nt look at it.

(sd) O.K. Caroe.
31.10.45.

D.369-P(C)/45.

Pol. Deptt.
E.A.Dept. U.O.No.D.8961-FE/45, dated the 2.11.45.

Our file on the subject is linked below and may be shown to the Secy. E.A. Dept.

itd. MHK.
5.11.45.

itd. A.N.B.N.
5.11.45.

Sd. C.G. Herbert,
6.11.45.

E. A. Deptt.(Secy. by name).
Pol. Dept. U.O.No.D.369-P(C)/45, dt. 6.11.45.

I read these papers with interest. Quite apart from the proposal in its bearing on the future of Hyderabad State in India, it seems to me extraordinary that the Nizam's Govt. should ever have thought it possible that the Portuguese will give up Goa, for the sale of the port of Marmagao would amount to as much. Without the port Goa is nothing. The proposition is even more extraordinary in that Hyderabad nowhere near touches the boundaries of the Goa territory. I think I am right in saying that the Bombay Districts of Belgaum, Dharwar and Bijapur intervene between Goa and Hyderabad. I cannot myself imagine the Portuguese even beginning to consider the surrender ~~xx~~ of their territory in India unless and until the Portuguese State more or less broke up making it impossible for the Portuguese Govt. to retain any of their colonial territories. We have not heard any rumour that this proposition has come to the notice of the Portuguese Govt. in Lisbon or the Portuguese ~~[illegible]~~ Colonial Govt. in Goa. I would not propose that we should mention it to H.M's Consul in Goa for presumably we do not wish to give the Portuguese any idea that the suggestion has been mooted. Political Deptt. should see.

Sd. O.K. Caroe,
7.11.45.

Pol. Dept. U.O. R.
E.A.D. U.O.No.D.8961-FE/45, dt.9.11.45.

12.

Seen and returned with thanks. (A copy of notes and corres. may be kept for Pol. Dept. file). D.3F5-P(C)/45.

itd. M.H.K.
14.11.45.
itd. A.N.B.N.
14.11.45.

Sd. J.S.H. Shattock,
15.11.45.

Sd. C.G. Herbert,
16.11.45.

D. No. 407-P(C)/45 (8) ~~F.R.~~

Submitted.

TH.
4.12.45

5.12.45.

~~DS I~~

I place below a draft letter to P.S.V.

C.G. Herbert
6.12.45

Pol. Adv.

many thanks
8/12/45.

(9) Issue

D No. 414-P(C)/44 (10)

D No. 408-P(C)/44 (11)

D No. 439-P(C)/43 (12)

P.S. & D.S.I.
may see (This file came to P. Br. open)
TH
13/12/45

C.G.H. 14/12

~~DS~~ 10/12

~~DSI~~ 11/12

P
14/12

Not 2 months
TH
13/1/46

[illegible] month
TH
11/12

[illegible]

D. No. 53-P(C)/46 (13)
D. No. 54-P(C) 46 (14)

For information only.

19.2.46.

19.2.46.

DSI

To whom were the Memoranda in S. No. 13 submitted? The extract does not indicate this.

J. S. H. Shattock.
20/2/46.

To the Parliamentary Delegation (party) which visited Hyderabad & consisted of Mr Sorensen, Brig Low & Earl of Munster. The extract has been completed. The omission noticed by DSI is much regretted.

20.2.46

DSI

Please see S. Nos 13-14 at [illegible] top of this file for information

J. S. H. Shattock.
20/2/46.

P.S.

V. G. Herbert
21.2.46

DSI 22/2

D. No. 66-P(C) 46 (15)

On this file we are concerned with para 6 of S no 15 which is for information only. Copies will be sent to the India Office on R. Br. file.

1/3/46

1.3.46

DSI

Please see S.No. 15. The question of the proposed location and constitution of the post-war army in India and their effect on the military guarantees included in the Crown's treaties with certain Indian States, with which S.No. 15 is mainly concerned, is being dealt with in Reforms Branch.

2. This file relates only to para. 6 of S.No. 15. No action is necessary.

J.S.H. Shattock

5-3-46.

C.G. Herbert

6. 3. 46.

~~P.S.~~

~~ASI~~ 6/3

7/3

P

6/3

R.U.

8/3

Record

[illegible]

C-O-R-R-E-S-P-O-N-D-E-N-C-E.

(1)

U

G 24/8/45

D. 314-P(S)/45

Hyderabad - Deccan
17th August 1945.

PRESIDENT OF H.E.H. THE NIZAM'S
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

My dear Sir Conrad Corfield,

Atlast the great war has ended in the complete victory of the Allied arms and through this letter I wish to congratulate you most sincerely on the great victory that had been given to the Allied arm by Almighty God. In the dark days of 1940 it was difficult to imagine of such a complete defeat of Axis powers but God in His mercy always helps those who stand for justice and fair-play; one feels happy to think that the future world will atleast for a long time be free from aggression.

I hope to come to Delhi next month to place before you certain problems in connection with the Hyderabad State. As far back as 1942 I had addressed a (1) letter dated the 20th December 1942 (No.633-CC) in which I placed the views of His Exalted Highness and his Government before the Government of India in connection with the post war arrangements, and it is in that connection that I should like to talk to you again. His Exalted Highness' definite policy is to maintain his relations with the Crown intact and in my opinion this

(1) Enclo to S.No. 42 in F.No. 376-P(S)/42

is

is a sound policy but the whole thing depends on the future policy of His Majesty's Government.

Just after the victory in Europe, I discussed with the Hon'ble the Resident and wrote privately to your predecessor also about the great services rendered by Hyderabad during the war. In the Political Department you have got full record of those services. Briefly, I may say that our expenditure on various war accounts had been 5 crores and 72 lakhs upto date and we have invested 50 crores and 23 lakhs in Government of India securities. Besides this, His Exalted Highness himself gave from his Privy purse 16 lakhs for an Air Squadron; Hyderabad presented one Bassett Trawler and one Corvette to the Imperial Navy and two Air Squadrons. The following Military Units have been placed at the disposal of the Government of India:--

3 Infantry Units.
2 Mechanised Cavalry Units;
1 Battery Unit; and
1 Transport Company.

I feel that politically it will be a good gesture if His Exalted Highness' unflinching loyalty to the Crown should get a recognition befitting the

great

great services rendered by Hyderabad.

When I come to Delhi I will speak to you in detail.

I have written this to you only privately. Before I speak to you when we meet, the whole question will be placed before you through the Hon'ble the Resident.

With kindest regards,

Yours sincerely,
Ahmad Said

Sir Conrad Corfield, KCSI., CIE., ICS., MC.,
Political Adviser to H.E.
the Crown Representative,
NEW DELHI.

(27) (4

New Delhi,
29th August 1945.

My dear Nawab Sahib,

Many thanks for your letter of the S. No. (1) 17th of August and for the congratulations which you have so kindly expressed.

I look forward to seeing you when you come to Delhi next month, and I note that you will have discussed the problems, which you propose to raise, with Sir Arthur Lothian beforehand.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

Sd. C.L. Corfield.

Nawab Sir Muhammad Ahmad Sa'id Khan,
KCSI, KCIE, MBE,
of Chhatari,
Hyderabad (Dn).

'das'

(2)

D. No-327-P(C)/45

IMMEDIATE.

CONFIDENTIAL.

D.O.No. 102-C.

THE RESIDENCY
HYDERABAD

BOLARUM,
the 6th September 1945.

DSP 5/10
P 1079

62-3 infra

My dear Griffin,

I transmit herewith for the consideration of His Excellency the Crown Representative 2 copies of a letter which I have received from the President of the Nizam's Executive Council containing a proposal for the institution of a Council for Greater India on the lines of that recommended by the Simon Commission. The President has written to me separately requesting that as His Excellency Lord Wavell is now in London discussing constitutional problems, he may kindly be apprised of the proposal now made by the Hyderabad Government before he leaves England.

Pl. let me
have the
Simon
Commission
Report with
the relevant
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
CC
10/9/45

Yours sincerely,

A C Lothian

To
L.C.L.Griffin,Esq.,C.I.E.,
Secretary to H.E.the Crown Representative,
New Delhi.

IMMEDIATE.

CONFIDENTIAL.

No.73-C. The 4th September 1945.

My dear Sir Arthur,

As the war has ended and constitutional changes may soon be introduced at the Centre or at least discussions initiated with the object of introducing such changes, I am desired to invite your attention to that part of the recommendations of the Simon Commission which deals with the proposal to establish a Council for Greater India. Since even an ad interim change at the Centre, based (as was the "Wavell Plan") on the executive deriving its personnel and support from the principal politcal parties in British India, may have the effect of transferring responsibility with regard to matters of common concern, the effects on the States of any change are likely to be far-reaching. A Council such as that recommended, with more or less the same scope and functions, but based upon representation of the governments at the Centre and in the Provinces and States, would ensure collabora-tion in matters of common concern and lead to a better understanding, by British India and the States, of each other's proble difficulties and views. Many avoidable misunderstandings would be removed and coordination made easier by conference and discussion. The body need only be small, compact, informal and advisory; by a convention, all measures and legislation with regard to matters of common concern could, before enforcement, be referred to it for opinion and advice. To the list of matters enumerated by the Simon Commission as matters coming within the purview of the Council may be added such others as have recently acquired considerable importance, for example, National Industries Postwar Planning, etc. Defence and External Relations would have to be excluded, however, as they form the subject of Treaties with the Crown.

2. H.E.H.'s Government feel that such a forum for exchange of views on matters of common concern would, besides solving many difficulties which are at present being felt both by the Centre and by the States, also obviate the need for Departmental Conference on different subjects and place consultation on a higher

plane . It may also have the effect of reducing to a minimum the occasions for the exercise of safeguards, as it may well be hoped that the process will help to avoid action or legislation by the Centre affecting the rights or interests of any State. Finally, the proposal has the virtue of not affecting the maintenance of direct relations with the Crown, a fact to which Hyderabad attaches fundamental importance.

3. I would appreciate being given an opportunity to discuss the above proposal in the first instance with yourself and later with the Political Adviser when I next visit Delhi.

Yours sincerely,
Sd. Ahmad Said.

To
The Hon'ble Sir Arthur Lothian, KCIE, CSI, ICS,
Resident at Hyderabad, The Residency, Hyderabad.

~~(3)~~ ~~(2)~~ (4) ~~4~~ 8

Pol DEPARTMENT/OFFICE.

File No.
Serial No.

Issue (CS) 12/9

DO Letter
Draft ~~Memorandum~~
~~Telegram~~

Secret.

New Delhi

1. Date of despatch. D 12/9
2. List of enclosures.

No. D. 327-P(C)/45 Dated 12-9-45

To - The Hon. Sir Arthur Lothian,
KCIE, CSI,
Resident at Hyderabad.

~~FR~~ ~~S No 2~~
S No 3

My dear Lothian,

Please refer to your confdl. d.o. letter No. 102-C of the 6th September 1945 forwarding copies of letter No.73-C dated the 4th September 1945 from the President of the Nizam's Executive Council containing a proposal for the institution of a Council for Greater India on the lines of that recommended by the Simon Commission I am desired to say that this letter was received too late to be forwarded to His Excellency

12/9

12/9

9/5

A

Lord Wavell for consideration during his discussions with His Majesty's Government. It will however be placed before His Excellency as soon as he returns.

Yours sincerely,
Sd/- L.C.L. Griffin,
PS

(5)

19

PRIVATE & PERSONAL
CONFIDENTIAL.

THE RESIDENCY HYDERABAD

No.1823-C. 15th September 1945.

20/9

D. 336-P(C)/45

S. No 3 / p 5 - ante

My dear Griffin,

p 11 infra

In continuation of my demi-official letter No.102-C, dated the 6th September, I enclose, for your information, a copy of a note of an interview which Chhatari, Savidge and Ali Yavar Jung had with me on the 4th September and which Chhatari requested might be sent on to you.

Yours sincerely,

ACLothian

20/9

L.C.L.Griffin, Esq.,C.I.E.,
Secretary to His Excellency the
Crown Representative, New Delhi.

G.S.R.
Encl:1.

NOTE.

Nawab Sir Ahmad Said Khan of Chhatari, President, Executive Council, Mr. C.A.G. Savidge, Officiating Revenue Member and Nawab Ali Yavar Jung Bahadur, Constitutional Adviser, had a talk with the Hon'ble the Resident at the Bolarum Residency on Tuesday, the 4th September 1945, on the subject of an outlet to the sea for Hyderabad.

2. With reference to the Commercial Treaty of 1802, and the rights of the State under that Treaty, they mentioned that the decision not to refer the interpretation of Article 3 to an impartial Judicial Tribunal had caused much dissatisfaction to the State which believed that the procedure it had urged was only fair, specially as the issue was of a justiciable nature.

3. With the termination of the war changes were likely in the constitution of India which were bound to affect the State. They said that Hyderabad was resolved to maintain its direct relations with the Crown, while remaining on friendly relations with its neighbours. The State believed that only thus could it secure its independent existence as an entity and be a continued link in the British connection as well as of assistance in the maintenance of stability in India. It must for that purpose, however, ensure its political and economic integrity. Its views on the former have already been communicated in its letter No.633-CC, dated 20th December 1942. So far as economic integrity is concerned, the question depended upon the State securing an outlet to the sea. If it succeeded in securing an effective outlet its economic future would be assured and the dispute under Article 3 of the Commercial Treaty of 1802 would be automatically settled.

Enclo S No
42 in
F No 376-P/42

4. Sir Ahmad Said Khan stated that he desired an opportunity to discuss Hyderabad's point of view in the matter with the Political Adviser and, later, with His Excellency the Crown Representative. He suggested that the first week of October would be suitable for the purpose as he would then be proceeding to Delhi to attend the meeting of the National Defence Council. He desired to secure the sympathy and assistance of His Excellency and of the Political Adviser in seeking the good offices of His Majesty's Government for the acquisition of the sea-port, if necessary, outside British India. Adjustments might possibly be required with British India and could be discussed at a later stage with representatives of the Central Government.

5. Sir Ahmad Said Khan added that as Faithful Ally of the British Government with his own and the State's record of services to his Ally, to the Empire and to India, His Exalted Highness felt that Hyderabad could rely on His Excellency's sympathy and support and on the fullest consideration being given to the State's future.

----

(6)

12

Pol **DEPARTMENT.**

BRANCH. Secret.

File No.

Serial No.

Draft D.O. Letter
~~Memorandum~~
Telegram

Class for telegrams

Ordinary
Express
Urgent*
Priority
Clear Line†

*Only for Foreign Telegrams.

†Not for Foreign Telegrams.

No. 7241-P(S)/45. Dated 22nd Octr 1945.

To - M. J. Clauson, Esq.,
Secretary, Political Dept.,
India Office, London.

To be issued on | Issued on

1st Reminder

2nd Reminder

3rd Reminder

Heading :

Case or Diary No.

If post copy of telegram required

Date of despatch of above

List of enclosures

(Code word for telegrams.)

Enclo. to S.N.5 (page 11)

Subject:- Desire of the Hyderabad Govt to obtain an outlet to the sea in order to secure its economic future.

---

dear Clauson,

I am desired to enclose for the information of the Secy of State a copy of a note forwarded by the Resident at Hyderabad in advance of his recent visit to Delhi with the Nawab of Chhatari. This note was discussed by the Political Adviser with the Resident and the Nawab. Savage also happened to be in Delhi at the same time, but it was considered inadvisable that he should be included in the discussions.

2. At these discussions the Nawab referred to Political Dept letter No. 376-P/42 dated the 25th June 1943, (a copy of which was forwarded to the India Office under cover of my predecessor's D.O. letter No. [illegible] dated the [illegible] June 1943),

File No. 376-P(S)/42
~~Slip X~~, S.N.30

fw 22/10 do. S.N. 31,

F. file
X DAH 22/10

S. S.
MGIPC—31—325 (CPS) DCF—(G.1432)—22-6-31—50,000 Pads.

which stated that, at the then state of uncertainty as to the future, no useful purpose would be served by attempting a detailed reply to the Hyderabad Government's reactions to constitutional changes resulting from the Cripps's offer. The Nawab said that the time had now come to reconsider this letter in view of the further constitutional discussions, which were now likely to take place.

It is proposed to await any further reference which the Hyderabad Govt may make on this question, but meanwhile the Secy of State may be interested to see the copies of the enclosed correspondence regarding a proposal for the institution of a Council for Greater India, which was not pursued by the Nawab of Chhatari, presumably in view of the statement subsequently made after H.E. Lord Wavell's return from discussions with His Majesty's Government.

pp.5-9 cor.

As regards an outlet to the sea, the Nawab urged that Hyderabad had strong moral claims to special consideration not only because of its Treaty position but because of its past friendship and recent war services; the State was most anxious to maintain its relationship with the Crown and considered that this maintenance was to the political advantage of both Britain and India. He expected that the Dominion of India, if it was established, would be anti-British and that the existence of a friendly Hyderabad would strengthen the Imperial position. He pointed out that the ceded districts had been handed over in return for protection and could not be transferred to any other authority without consent. In his view it was desirable both politically and strategically for the Crown to to retain some area of control in India and made comparison between the position of Hyderabad in India and the Sudan vis-a-vis Egypt. He stated that Hyderabad was economically and historially a stable unit and it was desirable to strengthen this stability by giving the State an outlet to the sea. This claim was strengthened by the terms of the 1802 Treaty regarding Masulipatam, but the present proposal was to approach the Portuguese Government with the object of purchasing the port of Goa. The State was anxious to elicit the support of His Majesty's Government for this approach and hoped that the Crown Representative would recommend it.

4. In reply to the Nawab's statement the Political Adviser suggested that any such approach to His Majesty's Government would be unfortunate. It would be interpreted as an attempt to strike a bargain in advance of forthcoming constitutional discussions, whereby Hyderabad would be placed in a position to stand out of an all-India scheme. This could hardly be viewed with favour by His Majesty's Government, whose main object was to transfer all such negotiations to India and whose main hope was that this would lead to an all-India constitution. The proposal would be bound to leak out if any approach was made, and the reactions in India would be serious. The Congress

would interpret it as an attempt to disrupt India and to secure a permanent hegemony of a Muslim minority over a Hindu majority. The communal dangers were obvious. Whether such a move would be supported by the Muslim League was open to question, since it would weaken their case in regard to Kashmir, where the Muslim majority was a more intimate concern of Pakistan. The proposal would certainly antagonize general Indian opinion, since it would be interpreted as an attempt on the part of the British Government to implement a policy of divide et impera. Even from the economic aspect the mere purchase of Goa would hardly be adequate to secure the State's economic security, since some corridor concession for imported goods might be involved, and this would be difficult to negotiate against a hostile Central Government: whereas, if bonded imports were contemplated, some agreement would be required about customs revenue, which would not be easy to secure or to guarantee.

5. The Nawab had a subsequent interview with H.E. the Crown Representative, who discouraged the proposal on similar lines; and at a subsequent talk with the Political Adviser the same points were emphasised again.

Yours sincerely,

Sd. C.G. Herbert

(DC)

BY AIR MAIL.

S E C R E T.

Ext.5410 1945.

India Office, London.
23rd October 1945.

Forwarded with the compliments of the Secretary, External Department, India Office.

To
The E. A. Dept., Government of India.

****

Ext.5410/45. 22nd October, 1945.

Dear Derick,

My Secretary of State has heard in a private letter from the ~~Secretary~~ Viceroy that the Hyderabad Government are anxious, if possible, to buy Goa (or, at any rate, part or all of the Port of Marmagao) from the Portuguese Government with a view to securing access from Hyderabad to the sea - a project which has long been prominent in Hyderabadi minds, though not in connection with this particular Port. It is thought that the idea is particularly attractive to them at the present time in view of the possibility of some independent Indian Union being formed, of which Hyderabad might not wish to form a part.

2. The project does not seem, on present showing, likely to come to anything and, in any case, since the British Crown conducts the foreign relations of Hyderabad, nothing could happen without His Majesty's Government's knowledge. We think, however, that the Foreign Office and, possibly, the Embassy at Lisbon, may like ~~that~~ to know privately about it. There is some reason to think that possibly Mir Laik Ali, a big business man from Hyderabad who has recently been in Europe, may have had some contact with some Portuguese authority or other and been given - or created in his own mind - the impression that the Portuguese Government might consider some transaction of this nature. But this conjecture is merely based on a remark made in conversation by a British officer in the Hyderabad Govt.

Yours ever,
Sd. Eion Donaldson.

F.R.Hoyer Millar, Esq., C.M.G., C.V.O.,
Foreign Office, S.W.1.

SECRET.

Forwarded to the Hon'ble Sir Conrad Corfield, KCIE, CSI, MC.

1407-P(S)/45

With the compliments of the ~~Private~~ Secretary ~~Secretary to His Excellency the Viceroy~~ to the Governor-General (Personal).

FOR FAVOUR OF COMMENT.

CH.H
30.11.45

GC 30/11/45

No. 529(6)/G.

New Delhi
~~Simla~~ , *the* 29th Novr. 1945.
~~Viceroy's Camp~~

P. S. V. 20.
GIPD—S1—9 PSV—7-5.43—5,000.

B

Extract from Private & Secret letter dated the 23rd November 1945 from the Secretary of State to His Excellency the Viceroy.

— S No 6 / pp 12-15 ante

12. I have seen Herbert's letter of 22nd October to Clauson and its enclosures reporting recent interviews which Chhatari has had with your Political Adviser and yourself at which he mentioned Hyderabad's desire to secure an outlet to the sea and for this purpose to acquire the port of Goa from Portugal and that the State was anxious to obtain His Majesty's Government's support for this approach. I note that Chhatari received no encouragement in this project. Hyderabad's demarche seems to have had some rather wide implications in relation to the constitutional question and I think I ought to bring the matter to the notice of my colleagues. Before I do so I should be glad to know if you have any further comment on Hyderabad' general attitude. I have heard indirectly that Chhatari has taken a good deal to heart the discouraging reception of his proposal.

D.O. No. D.457-P(C)/45

19

TOP **Secret**. (9)

New Delhi,
8th December 1945.

My dear Abell

S.No.4

D
[illegible]
8/12

Will you please refer to your No. 529(6)/G dated the 29th of November 1945, in which you enclosed for comment an extract from a private and secret letter dated the 2 rd of November 1945 from the Secy of State to H.E. the Viceroy regarding Hyderabad?

The Secy of State has enquired whether H.E. has any comments on the general attitude of Hyderabad to the constitutional question. That attitude is largely determined by a consistent opposition to any transfer of the State's relationship with the Crown to any other authority. It is probable that this opposition is strong enough to influence, if not actuallyto decide, the views of the Hyderabad Government on all subsidiary constitutional questions (such as Berar) and even in regard to many administrative matters (such as participation in all-India boards and committees dealing with questions of common interest) which may in their view affect the main constitutional issue. Objection to any transfer of the State's relations with the Crown has been a consistent characteristic of Hyderabad's policy from the beginning of the discussions which led up to the passing of the 1935 Act: it has not weakened since the Act became law and does not appear likely to do so, until the influence of the Hindu majority in the State can make itself felt more effectively. The Hyderabad Government's desire would be for Hyderabad to continue as a unit distinct from the rest of India and in relations with the British Crown: but the

20

pressure of events appears to be leading them to consider a loose federation without any clear idea of its structure.

Yours sincerely
Sd/. C. L. Corfield.

G.E.B.Abell,Esq.,OBE,
Pte Secy to H.E.the Viceroy,
New Delhi.

(10) SECRET. V.

14 C
14/12

Forwarded to The Hon'ble Sir Conrad Corfield, KCIE, CSI, MC.

DN 414-P(c)/45

With the compliments of the ~~Private~~ Secretary ~~Secretary to His Excellency the Viceroy~~ to the Governor-General (Personal).

No. 592(6)-G.

New Delhi
~~Simla~~, *the* 8. 12. 1945.
~~Viceroy's Camp~~

P. S. V. 20.
GIPD—S1—9 PSV—7-5-43—5,000.

Extract from Private and Secret letter No.45 dated the 5th December 1945 from His Excellency the Viceroy to the Secretary of State.

17. I will send you a further note on Hyderabad's general attitude, if you wish to bring it before your colleagues.

D 418 P(C)/45 (11) Dy. No. 5727-P(45) 25

SECRET. Extract from the Fortnightly Report of the Hyderabad Residency for the fortnight ending 30th November 1945.

....

8. The Anjuman Ittihad-ul-Muslimin held its annual conference in the Hyderabad City from the 23rd to the 25th November. In his presidential address, Abul Hasan Syed Ali criticised the present form of government in the State as being responspble neither to the people nor to the Ruler. He urged that the powers enjoyed by the Nizam before the Executive Council was created some 26 years ago, should be restored to him, criticised the alleged interference of the Paramount Power in the affairs of Hyderabad, and demanded the restoration to Hyderabad of the ceded districts and the grant to the State of the port of Masulipatam or Vizagapatam. He supported the Pakistan scheme and suggested that the forthcoming constitutional reforms in the State should be amended to include representation on a territorial basis, an extension of franchise and direct election. The following resolution passed at the meeting, is of interest :-

> "This public meeting of the Central Anjuman Ittihad-ul-Muslimin desires to impress upon the British Government and the Government of India that in view of the Treaties, Hyderabad enjoys the historical status of a permanent political entity, and the Anjuman desires to maintain this constitutional status always. The Government of India's interference in the administration of Hyderabad and its consultation or approval in the appointment or dismissal of State Ministers and officials, besides being unconstitutional, is doing unbearable harm instead of making any improvement in the administration. The~~y~~ use of Paramountcy in Hyderabad is adversely affecting the one crore and sixty lakhs people of Hyderabad, instead of being beneficial, and the responsibility for the maladministration of the country lies on Paramountcy. The Royal prerogatives of His Exalted Highness which had been restricted under special circumstances should now be restored. Therefore, in the opinion of this meeting of the Anjuman Ittihad-ul-Muslimin the independent and historical status of Hyderabad should be recognised. The present importation(of officials) and interference is an open breach of promise which Hyderabad cannot bear".

(12)

28/12/45 24

Forwarded to the Hon'ble Sir Conrad
Corfield, KCIE.,CSI.,
MC.

29/12

D.434 P(C)/45

26.12.45

With the compliments of the Private ~~Secretary~~
Secretary to His Excellency the Viceroy
to ~~the Governor General (Personal)~~.

No. 529 (6) 9/43.

New Delhi
~~*Simla*~~ , *the* 24-12- 1945.
~~*Viceroy's Camp*~~

P. S. V. 20.
GIPD—S1—9 PSV—7-5.43—5,000.

Extract from private and secret letter No.47, dated the 18th December 1945, from His Excellency the Viceroy to the Secretary of State.

Conf 18 ante

10. You asked me in your letter of the 23rd November for further comments on the general attitude of Hyderabad. The Nizam has large ideas about Hyderabad as an independent State, with increased borders and a port of its own; and would vehemently oppose any transfer of the State's relationship with the Crown to any other authority. This was the State's policy from the beginning of the discussions which led up to the 1935 Act. The Hyderabad Government would like Hyderabad to continue as a unit distinct from the rest of India and in relations with the British Crown: under the pressure of events they may consider a loose federation, but it would have to be very loose indeed to meet their ideas.

~~D 1[illegible] - P/46.~~
D 53 - PCCI/46

SECRET.

Extract from the Fortnightly Report of the Hyderabad Residency for the second half of January 1946.

M.K.
18/2

....

X X X

9. The Parliamentary delegation X X. During their stay here they interviewed local political leaders X & received memoranda from a X variety of public organisations.

X X X X

X X X The memoranda of the Jagirdars Association and Anjuman Ittihad-ul-Muslimin stressed the necessity for the recognition of Hyderabad's independent status, its complete freedom in internal and external affairs, the return of the Ceded Districts and the necessity for an outlet to the sea. Memoranda were also submitted by the Andhra Maharashtra and Karnatak conference, the Depressed Classes Association, the Religious Leaders' Association and other bodies.

X X X X X

****

(14) 21

DY. No. 54-F(C)/46

SECRET.

Extract from Fortnightly report of the Hyderabad Residency for the second half of January 1946.

X X X X

10. Reference para. 7 of my last report. The publication of a news item in the "Daily Express" of London, that the Hyderabad Government is trying to secure a 100 mile corridor through the Madras Presidency to give Hyderabad a way to the Bay of Bengal, and that under this proposal the ports of Masulipatam and Cocanada will go to Hyderabad, is said to have roused opposition from Andhra political circles of the Madras Presidency.

X X X X

(15)

28

S_E_C_R_E_T.

No. F.7(1)-C/46.

(original in R Br)

The Residency,
Hyderabad.
21st February 1946.

6 (…)/46

My dear Herbert,

Please refer to Political Department secret express letter No. F.13(19)-I.A./45 dated the 25th January 1946, enclosing a copy of Home Department Memorandum No. 174/32/45-Police, dated the 15th December 1945 and a map showing the proposed location of the post-war army in India. I understand that the proposals regarding the future distribution of the Army are still fluid, and I should, therefore, like to take this opportunity of bringing to your notice certain political aspects of this question which seem to me to require consideration at the highest level before final decisions are made.

v Internal Security

2. In so far as Secunderabad is concerned it is apparently intended that an Indian Armoured Division should be stationed there and also a Corpse Headquarters, but no British Infantry. It is very doubtful, however, whether a garrison of this composition will be accepted by the Nizam's Government as adequately discharging our obligations under article 2 of the treaty of 1853. For an Armoured Division, even although its value for battle purposes exceeds greatly that of a comparable number of men organised as infantry, may nevertheless not be suitable in the same degree for internal security purposes, and I am certain that the Nizam's Government would view with grave apprehension the possibility that there would be no British battalion of infantry in the Secunderabad garrison.

3. There is an even more important aspect of the matter. The Nizam's Government are most anxious to remain a separate independent unit in treaty relations with the British Crown, whatever shape the future Indian polity assumes, whether a unitary government for the whole of British India and the States, or whether the principle of Pakistan is conceded and the new India consists of a Hindustan, a Pakistan, and a States Union. In the latter event they would probably wish to enter into agreements with one or all of these units, but as a separate independent entity, and not as part of any of them. While therefore they would welcome the stationing of any troops in Secunderabad that would remain under British control in the new political set up, they are sure to object to troops under the control of any Indian Government being stationed there, as being a violation of the 1853 treaty and a menace to their independence. Their attitude, therefore, to this question of the location of troops is bound to be affected by these considerations.

4. It would seem most desirable, therefore, from the political angle, should it be necessary to alter the former peace time distribution of the army in advance of the impending political changes, to make Secunderabad one of the four stations contemplated as a 3 battalion infantry station - I assume that one at least of these would be a British battalion - which perhaps could be done by a redistribution of units as between Secunderabad and Jubbulpore, or alternatively, to station at least one battalion of British infantry in Secunderabad in addition to the troops contemplated in the scheme received by me.

5. As a minor point relevant to the present discussion, I would invite your attention to the proposal made in paragraph 3(7) of my top secret letter No. 44-C, dated the 10th May 1945, that 2 companies of British troops should be available for stationing in Hyderabad Residency in a certain contingency.

in separate file in P

---6.---

p 28-31 infra

6. As it is of some interest in this connexion I enclose a copy, which I have just obtained, of the representation made to the recent British Parliamenentary delegation by the Ittehad-ul-Muslimin, and would invite your attention in particular to the paragraph headed "Territorial Cessions". Although the Ittehad is not an official organisation, it often interprets fairly accurately the desires of the Nizam and his government.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) A.C. Lothian.

C.G. Herbert, Esq., C.S.I., C.I.E.,
Secretary to His Excellency the Crown Representative,
New Delhi.

Memorandum placed before the British Parliamentary Delegation
by
The Majlis-e-Ittehadul Muslemeen, Hyderabad Deccan.

Dated 21st January 1946.

Gentlemen,

The Majlis-e-Ittehadul Muslemeen is the sole representative political organisation of the Muslim of the Dominions of Hyderabad. It was founded in 1930, and has ever since strenuously endeavoured on the one hand to interpret the needs and aspirations of the Hyderabad Muslims to Government, and to rouse their political consciousness on the other; so much so, that today there is hardly a village in the Dominions which has not a branch of this wide organisation.

The Majlis understands that the Mission of the Delegation is one of good will towards India and as such the Majlis takes this opportunity to welcome you to this ancient historic city of Hyderabad and to wish the Delegation every success in its endeavour to study and appreciate with an open mind the complex constitutional problem of this country.

Therefore the Majlis would draw the attention of the Delegation to the constitutional problem as it affects Hyderabad, it considers it necessary to touch upon one or two aspects of Hyderabad life by way of introduction.

The area occupied by the Dominions of Hyderabad has a history of its own. Unlike its neighbouring British Indian provinces, Hyderabad has for nearly 800 years been under the direct influence of Muslim culture which in the heyday of the Moghul rule exhibited a happy blending of what was noble and of good report in the Muslim and Hindu Cultures - a blending which is so clearly noticeable in the Hyderabad of today. While in the adjoining provinces, provincialism is a dominant factor in politics and administration, the Delegation will find here a cosmopolitan atmosphere - a common meeting ground for diverse races, languages and cultures all contributing a sense of solidarity such as is not found in other parts of India - a solidarity inspired and cemented by a succession of benevolent and paternal rulers whose one aim in life, as endorsed by history, has been the good of their people regardless of creed or race or class.

Hence it is that in Hyderabad, a form of Government has gradually been developed which has assimilated at each important stage the forces of progress filtering into the Dominions from outside. Now that the entire constitutional structure of India is to be overhauled, and India rendered a free partner in a commonwealth of free countries, the people of Hyderabad, both Muslims and Hindus, have grown alive to the imperative need of contributing their own share in the building up of this new freedom.

What form the constitutional structure within the Dominions will assume in the new order, it is yet too early to say. But the Majlis feels confident that with the keen and living interest of their beloved ruler in the abiding welfare of his subjects, a system of Government will be evolved which will have its foundation laid deep in the psychology and tradition of the people.

But this is an internal problem, just a demestic affair in respect of which, the Majlis have no desire to take up the valuable time of the Delegation. What concerns us deeply at this hour and what should form the subject of the delegation's primary attention is the constitutional issue. What position is Hyderabad to occupy in any new constitution scheme for India.

Our

Our association with the British in India goes back nearly two centuries, during which period there has been striking co-operation in the preservation of peace and the defence of territories: this has been strengthened by the distinguishing appelation of 'Faithful Ally'. But the political situation has undergone a serious change, and the time has arrived for what would appear to be the gradual elimination of British power in India. It is necessary therefore to take stock of our position. In doing so we must keep in mind that it was in pursuance of that friendship with the British that various privileges were granted to or compromise effected temporarily with other parts of India, under varying conditions and by different individuals. These cannot be allowed to continue and overlay the main principle of negotiations with the Indian Unions.

Dominions Status.

The "Dominions of H.E.H. the Nizam" have all along held Dominion Status which is only now proposed to be recognised for the Union or Unions of India. Hyderabad has also been an entity separate from the rest of India, and it is desirable that it should remain so in future. As remarked by Sir Stafford Cripps, her has been an "absolutely special position"; and all the attributes of an independent country must therefore be automatically enjoyed by her. She should be on equal terms with the other Dominion Governments that may be created in India, as any inferior position will lead to the ultimate weakening of her identity and sovereign powers.

Relations with the Crown in the United Kingdom.

We wish to maintain our relations with the British Crown by remaining within the Commonwealth. Our old Treaties will however have to be revised, in accordance with the needs and the spirit of the times. As Sir Stafford Cripps says, the economic, commercial and fiscal parts of the Treaties will be made the subject of arrangements with the Unions or States. But the view he has expressed that the military part will come under Paramountcy is disquieting. Hyderabad existed as a Sovereign State before it entered into Treaty relationship with the British Crown and has remained virtually independent. Besides, the qualification of Paramountcy is opposed to the sentiment underlying the proposals.

Paramountcy, with its unlimited and undefined privileges, was a term used when there was no intention of conferring Dominion Status: its employment now will produce a bad effect on the public, who regard it as only another name for Imperialism. The relations between the British Crown and Hyderabad will certainly need to be defined. We should not ask for military assistance in order to quell troubles within the State. But there should be no such restriction as that the manufacture of certain arms is the privilege of the Crown, nor should a limitation be imposed on the strength of the Forces Hyderabad may wish to maintain. There ought to be complete freedom to arm and augment the number of the Forces.

In the new Treaty, no usage or practice, which cannot be recognised under the general principles of International Law should find a place: certain usages have grown up which are even contrary to the express provisions of the old Treaties. The new Treaty should also be subject to revision after a defined period of, say, twenty years.

Territorial Cessions.

The problem of our Defence is a matter for serious consideration. There is not to be one Union in India; and, even if we want to entrust our defence to any particular Union, it will give rise to complications as to which should be selected. As a matter of fact the possibility of a Union choosing to be neutral in the event of a war involving the United Kingdom, leaves us no alternative but that our Defence should remain with us. This adds emphasis to the question of the rendition of the Ceded territories.

The Cessions were in lieu of military aid and were made to the Crown. In answer to the Memorandum of the Hyderabad Delegation, Sir Stafford Cripps has said that it would not be worth the complication for these territories to be administered on behalf of the Crown. But we wish to have our Agreement interpreted in a reasonable way. This issue of territory is one which cannot be shirked - particularly in view of the situation that has since developed. The State will be obliged to accept the consequence of her extent and location once fixed.

In the case of Berar it is clear that the position arising from the grant of Dominion Status will necessitate its rendition unreservedly. Whether the bargain made in 1936 was harsh or not, Hyderabad need surely fear no such treatment as the imposition upon her of terms which will lead to the absorption of a territory held by the British Government in trust. That trust cannot be passed on to the Indian Unions.

The question is rather what, besides Berar, Hyderabad reasonably can demand. Now it is a well-known fact that she had control of a hinterland extending from the Chilka Lake to almost the extreme Southerly point of India. By successive cessions of territory she has become landlocked; and if she is to continue without her lines of communication leading to the Sea coast, her authority will get water-logged. The matter is one of vital importance to her for many kinds of State activity. Without a hinterland it may not even be possible, by any tour de force of definition, for her to fulfil her obligations, or for the British to fulffl theirs.

An arrangement, and one to which we are entitled is the reversion to us of the Northern Circars. A large part of this territory was only recently transferred to the Province of Orissa; and the Andhras are dissatisfied with the separation from their Des. The one-sided transaction of the capitalisatio of the Peebkash amounting to Rs.9 lakhs per annum for a sum of Rs.1 crore, has been throughout a matter for reconsideration.

The reversion of these territories, viz. the Berars and the Northern Circars, constitutes our minimum demand. There remains the question of what are known as the Ceded Districts. We do not follow the formula of Sir Stafford Cripps, which appears to be based on the assumption that the contemplated transfer is just from the Crown in the United Kingdom to the Crown in India. Since the Proposals allow for Session it is not possible to maintain this assumption; indeed there are already indications that the Indian Unions do not wish to retain even in partial measure, the British connection. With the transfer of responsibility from the British Government to the Indian Unions, the whole question of the territories demands consideration; and His Exalted Highness's consent to any transfer of territory will need to be obtained, as Sovereign rights will come to be prejudiced.

Here we must draw attention to another important matter. There are several enclaves now in Hyderabad territory, such as Munagal, Lingagiri, etc. Their continuance is not desirable. We may mention in this connection the Taluka of Barsi, which we believe was assigned along with Berar, but was not retroceded when Raichur and certain areas in Osmanabad were given back.

Treaty with the Unions in regard to matter of common concern.

Now that it is proposed to create Unions enjoying Dominion Status, economic, commercial and extra territorial questions will have to be dealt with. In the discussions that took place for Federation of India, the Hyderabad share of Sea-customs duty was proposed to be regarded as contribution

towards

towards expenditure for the Defence of India. We did not accept this, as it had already been paid for by way of Cession of territories. The conditions have since altered, and there is no longer any question of such contribution. We wish to pull our full weight in the development of India as a whole. But our Sea customs must belong to us in the fiscal arrangements to be made with the Union or Unions.

At this stage there should be no attempt at bargaining for privileges. What is important first is to remove the servitudes or inequalities that have crept in such matters as Railways, Railway Jurisdiction, Excise, Opium, Salt, Post and Telegraphs, Telephones, Wireless etc. The usage or the practice that has grown within the last two hundred years has nothing to do with the Union or Unions that are to come into existence, and a careful analysis is called for. Nothing should be allowed to be passed on; we must abrogate any Agreements whose continued existence is inconsistent with our interests. As time progresses other subjects will no doubt come in for consideration. In regard to these we have the liberty to conclude new conventions in future.

We earnestly hope that through your good offices the case of our beloved country will be represented in its true aspect before the British Parliament.

(Sd) Md. Yamin Zubairi,

Secretary.

ROUTINE

[illegible]

H.E.

I had half an hour with the Nawab of Chhatari this morning before he saw Your Excellency. He took the following points:-

(1) Hyderabad should remain a Sovereign State in any settlement that may be made with H.M.G. Berar which is legally Hyderabad territory, should not be absorbed into any Indian Union, but should remain under a condominium of H.M.G. and the Hyderabad Government.

I said that this obviously raised a very big issue on which I could express no opinion. I thought that any decision by Hyderabad not to join an Indian Union would have a profound effect on the other Indian States. I also suggested that Berar, which is inhabited largely by well-to-do and politically minded Hindus, might not agree to the arrangement proposed and might be politically a nuisance to the Hyderabad Government.

The Nawab developed his argument on strategic grounds and said that H.M.G. would need a Base for Military and Air Forces in India. He has not thought the idea out as towards the end of our conversation he said that notwithstanding the arrangement he proposed, Hyderabad might be a Member of a loose Indian Federation.

A

(2) H.M.G. should use their good offices to get a permanent access to the sea for Hyderabad. The Nawab realised the difficulty of securing British territory, but thought the Hyderabad Government might negotiate successfully with Portugal or France for the purchase of one of their ports.

This is a very old story and I made no comment on it.

(3) The Nizam expects a substantial personal reward for his War Services. He particularly wants -

PTO

(a) the removal of all restrictions on his powers; and

(b) the grant of the title of "King of the Deccan and Berar".

This is also a very old story and I made no comments.

2. The Nawab said that he wanted to see me again in a few days time so that I could give a considered opinion. I said I should be delighted to see him, but that these matters were for Y.E., and that if he wanted advice at the official level, the Political Adviser was the proper person to give it.

3. I am sending a copy of this note to Political Adviser.

Sd/- E.M.Jenkins

P.S.V.
1.10.1945.

Copy forwarded for information to the Hon'ble Sir Conrad Corfield, KCIE., CSI., MC.

P.S.V.
1.10.1945.

TOP SECRET.

Routine.

In the absence of papers regarding His Majesty's Government's intention about the constitutional discussions to be held after the Provincial elections, office is not in a position to offer any useful suggestions on the point raised by the Secretary of State. It is however pretty certain that Hyderabad would refuse to join any union on the basis of "Cripps' proposals". The ardent desire of Hyderabad to acquire a corrider to the sea might in certain circumstances prove to be an invaluable bargaining counter in future negotiations and particularly in getting the Nizam to accord us a free hand for the disposal of Berar (cf. para 8 of Sir Kenneth Fitze's (1) note dated the 28th April 1943 and para 8 of ~~the~~ Mr. Narahari Rao's (2) note dated the 13th May 1943). It is doubtful whether the public opinion, specially Hindu, in British India would ~~permit~~ react favourably to any such bargaining being started. Under certain circumstances the Hindus of South India may, however, themselves take initiative on the lines of para 8 of Mr. Narahari Rao's note referred to above. But it seems extremely doubtful for Hyderabad to survive as an independent unit after the withdrawal of British protection. The future of Hyderabad dynasty lies in a loose federation.

(1) N/F13 7 A 376-P/42 Slip K

(2) — ibid — N/F16 Slip K

— ibid —

cf 'A' in Flag X

Please see regular note below.

NK.
4.12.45

RAL
5.12.45.

The point on which comment is required is the portion sidelined A of page 18/cor. This seems to be answered to some extent by Sir Evan Jenkins' note dated 1st October 1945 at slip X and Political Adviser's note on pp.8-9/notes as well as pp.6-7 and 11/cor.

S. S. H.
5-12-45.

Please see regular note.

C. G. Herbert
6.12.45